National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

University of Alberta

Perceptions of Tenured Teachers Involved in Summative versus Summative/Formative Supervision Models

By

Tanni L. Parker

A thesis

submitted to the faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Department of Educational Administration

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1995

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-06414-X

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Tanni L. Parker

Title of Thesis: Perceptions of Tenured Teachers Involved in Summative versus Summative/Formative Supervision Models

Degree: Master of Education

Year this Degree Granted: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Tanni L. Parker
51307, Range Road 224,
922-6038
Sherwood Park, AB
T8C 1H3

Date: August 29, 1995

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Perceptions of Tenured Teachers Involved in Summative versus Summative/Formative Supervision Models* submitted by *Tanni L. Parker* in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of *Master of Education*

Dr. J.L. da Costa

Dr. W.G. Maynes

Dr. K.J. Willson

Date: August 29, 1995

In memory of my brother

Gregory Allen Dziki

1953-1993

Your courage and strength

continually sustain and inspire me.

With you in my heart no challenge is too great.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions toward teacher evaluation. More specifically, the study attempted to discover the impact of these processes on the teachers' professional growth and improvement of classroom instruction. Respondents fell into two categories, summative evaluation only and a combination summative/formative process.

The data were collected through semi-structured interviews with ten tenured teachers from two school jurisdictions. Following analysis of the data, it became apparent that the way in which these teachers perceived teacher evaluation was dependent on the type of process in which they were involved.

Teachers involved in a formative model were knowledgeable of the process, trusted their supervisors, and perceived the process to be a useful tool for their own professional growth.

Teachers involved in the summative only models treated the entire process with a great deal of indifference and felt no impact, positive or negative, on their growth or improvement of classroom skills. These teachers often questioned their supervisors' skills and abilities to accurately judge their performance.

It was concluded that teachers must be allowed to be actively involved in their evaluation process and treated as equals not subordinates. Data for evaluations should be collected from a variety of sources and shared with teachers in a timely and collaborative manner. Teachers in this study also believed incentive programs should not be implemented, as the costs outweighed the benefits.

Themes of empowerment and collaboration must take the place of control and hierarchy if teacher evaluation models are to meet the needs of the competent tenured teacher.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my sincere gratitude and deepest appreciation to those individuals who made this study possible. It was only with their unique contributions that my goal has been attained. I share this achievement with each one of them.

To my advisor, Dr. Joe da Costa for sharing his insight and knowledge in the area of teacher supervision. As well, I could not have completed this document without his unwavering support, encouragement, and friendship. To the members of my committee, Dr. W.G. Maynes and Dr. Katherine Willson, for their suggestions and contributions.

To the ten teachers who so willingly gave of their personal time to share their experiences regarding teacher evaluation with me. The care and dedication to the teaching profession and students that you shared was a reaffirmation for me. Teachers do care.

Thanks also to the instructors from the Department of Educational Policy Studies with whom I have had the pleasure to become acquainted. You have all have contributed to this achievement on both a scholarly and a personal level.

Finally to my friends and colleagues whom I had the good fortune to meet as a student this year. It was a year of laughter and jokes, of hardship and support, of sharing and collaborating, and through it many of us made the transformation from colleague to friend. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1 Purpose of the Study	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	4
Identification of Bias	5
Delimitations	5
Limitations	6
Significance of the Study	6
Organization of Thesis	7
2 Review of the Literature	8
Introduction	8
Definitions of Teacher Evaluation	9
Formative versus Summative Evaluation	11
The Purpose of Teacher Evaluation	16
Summative Evaluation Models	18
Formative Supervision Models	20
Rationale for Change	24
Inadequacies of the Traditional Summative Process	24
Changing Nature of Schools	25
Basic Conditions for an Effective Evaluation System	28
Use of Incentive Programs	28
Change in Teacher Evaluation: From Theory to Practice	31

3 Research Method 33
Type of Study 33
Research Instrument 34
Description of the Sample 36
Characteristics of the Respondents 36
Determination of Formative and Summative Categories 37
Data Collection 39
Data Analysis 40
Pilot Study 40

4 Findings and Discussion 43
Pilot Study Findings and Discussion 43
Lack of Clarity 43
The Limited Role of the Teacher 44
Feedback and Follow-up Conference 46
Professional Development and the Evaluation Process 47
Findings and Discussion from the Main Study 51
Definition of Preferred Term 51
Purpose of Teacher Evaluation 53
Teacher Knowledge of the Process 54
Goal Setting 59
Trust and the Role of the Evaluator 63
Data Gathering Techniques 66
Sharing Feedback 68
Use of Incentive Programs 73
Proposed Changes to Teacher Evaluation Practices 76

Responses to the Research Questions 81
Sub-Problem #1 81
Sub-Problem #2 81
Main Research Question #1 82
Main Research Question #2 82

5 Conclusions and Recommendations 84
Overview of the Study 84
Conclusions 85
Recommendations 87
Personal Reflection: "A Final Word" 88
References 90
Appendixes 94
Tables
1. Congruence of Philosophy, Theory and Practice in Evaluation 13
2. The Shifting Paradigm in Supervision 27
3. Characteristics of the Respondents 38
4. Comparison of Evaluation Process Components 57

Chapter One

Purpose of the Study

Introduction

Public education has come under close scrutiny in recent years. "The supposed failing of schools has led to a rush of proposed reforms, for the most part they focus on the alleged inadequacies of teachers; specifically, teachers are viewed as being deficient and in need of help" (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989, p. vii). In an attempt to ensure accountability much attention has turned to the development of "more sophisticated systems of teacher surveillance and appraisal" (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989, p. vii). The recent recommendations from Alberta Education to develop two-pronged formative and summative systems of teacher evaluation has brought the topic of teacher evaluation once again to the forefront of educational debate. School jurisdictions are expected to examine the effectiveness of their evaluation policies, especially as they relate to the competent tenured teacher.

Controversy surrounding teacher evaluation is not a recent development. The debate between teachers as professionals and teachers as technicians has been, and continues to be, central to the issue. Peterson (1982) highlighted this point by stating:

> In 1916, for example, Sara H. Fahey, President of the National Education Association's (NEA) Department of Classroom Teachers launched a forceful attack on the so-called "efficiency system" as a pernicious and wrong-headed effort to standardize the relationship between individual teachers and students. (cited in McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988 p. 2)

Teachers continue to voice dissatisfaction with teacher evaluation. Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy (1993) concluded that is was the experienced teacher who felt the greatest amount of frustration with teacher evaluation:

> Some experienced teachers spoke out strongly against the use of criteria which assessed the basic teaching skills of veteran teachers. They felt insulted that anyone would consider that they did not have these skills after ten of more years of successful teaching, and they saw the evaluation process as a waste of time for administrator and teacher because it denied their growth as professionals. (p. 292)

Teacher evaluation policies and practices are surrounded by complex and diverse issues. Hickcox (1993) described three aspects that he felt were at the core of the teacher evaluation crisis:

> Many school boards I know have fairly fancy policies regarding performance appraisal for teachers. But they tend to suffer from mass deficiencies....They reflect a status quo and pay no attention to research and knowledge in this area....Most policies I look at, and most practices in fact do not differentiate between teachers experiencing difficulty and those who are not....There is no distinction between summative and formative evaluation. (p. 3)

The Alberta government has made some movement to respond to the evaluation difficulties described by Hickox and the document entitled, Toward Teacher Growth: A Study of the Impact of Alberta's Teacher Evaluation Policy. Reno Bossetti, the Deputy Minister of Education, in a letter to provincial school superintendents stated the need for the following:

> Teacher evaluation policy recognize the need for two distinct models of teacher evaluation. The "model of teaching as a technical expertise" has been implemented well and is meeting the needs of novice teachers or those who are experiencing difficulty...however, experienced and technically

competent teachers need a more dynamic model of teacher evaluation. The "model of teaching as professional judgment" involves teachers in a collaborative process in improving their practice. (R.A. Bosetti, personal communication, April 22, 1994)

In summary, the evaluation process for most tenured teachers has not been a positive experience. Currently the Alberta government has recognized the need for the development of evaluation which involves the competent, tenured teacher in a process based, formative model.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of tenured teachers toward evaluation practices. "The effectiveness of any teacher evaluation system--its ability to promote genuine accountability, its ability to contribute valid, reliable information to teachers' improvement--depends finally on the responses of those being evaluated, the teachers" (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988, p. 4). Insights gained through this process will assist in the continued improvement and development of evaluation practice which address the needs the competent, tenured teacher.

The study addressed the following questions.

1. How do tenured teachers perceive evaluation practices?
2. Does a difference in perception exist between teachers who are involved in a formative evaluation model and those involved in a traditional, summative model?

The related sub-problems are:

1. What effects do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had on their own professional growth?
2. What impact do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had in terms of improvement of their instruction?

Definition of Terms

The term "teacher evaluation" and other related terms have been defined in a number of different ways in the literature. Teacher evaluation or evaluation, when used in this document, refer to the generic process in which all teachers in this study participated. Specific terms used in this report are defined as follows:

1. Summative evaluation is an evaluation which is judgment and decision based. It involves the summing up of a performance by an evaluator. Criteria are externally imposed by the evaluator.
2. Formative evaluation is an evaluation which is developmental in nature. It could take a variety of forms including: clinical supervision, co-operative professional development, or self-directed development. It will also be referred to as formative supervision in this document. The formative models examined in this study also contained a summative aspect as all the respondents received a final report regarding their performance. When the term formative supervision or formative evaluation is used in this document it includes the summative aspect as described above.
3. Traditional evaluation is an evaluation process which is commonly implemented for both tenured and non-tenured teachers. Traditional evaluation processes vary slightly but all have the same core components. These components include: a meeting with the evaluator regarding a time to observe the classroom, a short classroom observation, a written report which may be shared with the teacher and a copy that may be sent to central office.
4. Tenured teacher is a teacher who has a continuing contract with the school board with whom he or she is employed.

Identification of Bias

Due to the fact that the researcher has been a teacher for a number of years, and had been subject to evaluation practices which did not assist in professional development or improvement of instruction, there are a number of potential biases.

Based on these experiences and the literature that was reviewed, one would expect to find that tenured teachers would have strong opinions regarding the futility of an evaluation process which was summative or traditional in nature.

Alternately, teachers who have had the opportunity to be involved in an evaluation practice in which the main thrust was formative, with an emphasis on initiating professional growth, would be much more satisfied with the evaluation practice. "Fenton (1989) reports that teachers believe that supervisors using a cooperative supervision model are more likely to participate in the evaluation process because of a desire to help improve teaching than to simply fulfill a legal requirement" (as cited in Gray, McLaughlin & Bialozor, 1992, p.19).

To counteract the effects of these biases, information that is contrary to this proposed trend was sought. This was accomplished through the use of in-depth interviews of two groups of teachers; those involved in traditional summative process, and those involved in a formative process. This issue is discussed further in Chapter Three.

Delimitations

1. This study was delimited to exploring the perceptions of ten teachers in regards to teacher evaluation in their respective schools.
2. The study was delimited to two school jurisdictions in the Greater Edmonton Area.
3. The study was delimited to interview methodology.

Limitations

1. A limitation of the study was the methodology used. Other methods would produce additional insights on the subject under study.
2. The study was limited by the willingness of the respondents to share their feelings and perceptions with the investigator and their ability to recall events accurately.
3. The study was also limited by the skill of the investigator to conduct interviews.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of the study deals with the perception of teachers toward evaluation practices. Recommendations from this study reiterate the importance of tenured teachers being actively involved in all aspects of the evaluation process. The literature supports the notion that for both change and growth to occur at the school level, teachers must be actively involved in a formative process. "Principals who make a difference know that is important to provide growth opportunities for successful, experienced teachers...the challenge to the principal is clear--provide an evaluation process that encourages experienced teachers to grow professionally" (DePasquale, Jr., 1990, p. 19).

The individual needs of tenured teachers for professional growth must be seen as being of equal importance to fulfilling the legal requirement accomplished by a summative evaluation. The move by Alberta Education to recognizing the need for a dual system of evaluation is only the first step in the development of more responsive evaluation polices. The teachers interviewed for this study provided some direction regarding specifics of what all tenured teachers require from teacher evaluation.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter One has presented an overview of the educational trends related to the problems surrounding teacher evaluation. Most directly there is increased attention being placed on schools and school boards to create a growth-oriented evaluation system. For formative systems to be successful, teachers' perceptions of current evaluation processes should be examined to ensure the new system will be responsive to teacher needs. Potential research biases, definition of key terms and the limitations and delimitations of the study were also presented.

Chapter Two is an overview of literature pertaining to teacher evaluation. It acquaints the reader with relevant studies and research. The literature review also assisted in the establishment of guidelines to develop and analyze interview questions.

In Chapter Three the method used to conduct the study is described. Detailed descriptions of the sample and procedures used to collect the data are presented. A description of the pilot study and its role in the development of the data collection techniques, data processing and analysis are also described in this section.

The findings of the research are presented in Chapter Four. The findings are be reported so that each of the questions posed in the problem statement is addressed.

Chapter Five is a summary of the document. In it are presented the conclusions and recommendations arising from the findings. Recommendations fall into two categories, those for practice and those for theory.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Since June, 1985, a government mandate has required Alberta school jurisdictions to implement teacher evaluation policies. This drastically increased the number of school jurisdictions with such policies. "The highest proportion (70.7%) of policies comes from 1985 or later, suggesting that most school jurisdictions either initiated or reviewed their policies in accordance with the 1985 provincial mandate" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly, & Ratsoy, 1993, p. 20). Policy implementation has not increased confidence in teacher evaluation for either teachers or administrators. In reality, this mandate has placed great demands on schools, administrators and teachers. "Yet the record to date suggests that such mandates have not made much of a difference in improving the quality of teaching and learning" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993, p. 23). Teachers protest that "teacher evaluation trivializes the teaching task and erodes the professionalism sought by educators. The rule-based checklists used in most school districts derive their authority from *bureaucratic* forms of control, not professional authority" (McLaughlin & Pfeifer,1988, p. 3). Frymier (1990) suggested that those implementing policies are no more satisfied than the teachers. "Supervisors are confronted with these realities: The public expects more; there are more imposed restraints; and those who live and work in schools are unenthusiastic about changes imposed on them by others in attempts to improve the schools" (cited in Glickman, 1990, p. xii). McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) echoed this concern when they stated:

> Many building-level administrators join teachers in giving low marks to the overall utility of most teacher evaluation schemes. In most school districts teacher evaluation is an irritating administrative burden that accomplishes

> little and, administrators fear, that risks poisoning otherwise productive working relationships with school staff. (p.3)

To be successful, evaluation policies and procedures should relate more to the needs of the teachers, students, and schools and less to the overwhelming pressure of public accountability. This was one of the conclusions reached in the document, Toward Teacher Growth: A Study of the Impact of Alberta's Teacher Evaluation Policy (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy 1993). The authors concluded that:

> In general, the impact of the provincial policy on teacher evaluation has been positive, but the teacher evaluation process is only beginning to evolve from a discrete task to be done in order to comply with board and provincial policy to one that is an integral part of the leadership goals of the school and the system. (p. 296)

The literature pertaining to teacher evaluation is overwhelming. The purpose of this review is to present a synopsis of related trends and issues in the area. The following components of teacher evaluation are examined: (a) definitions and purposes of teacher evaluation, (b) comparison between models of formative and summative evaluation, (c) basic conditions for successful evaluation programs, (d) incentive programs, and (e) implications and conditions for change.

Definitions of Teacher Evaluation

There exists a myriad of definitions and conceptualizations regarding teacher evaluation and its purposes. Dagley and Orso (1991) separated the concept of teacher evaluation into two areas: evaluation and supervision. These writers define evaluation as "the administrative task of judging the effectiveness and quality of teaching, often to

determine the future employment of the teacher" (1991, p. 73). Hickman (1992) presented a more comprehensive definition:

> Evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or adequacy of something according to definite criteria and purpose. The judgment is based on careful comparison with criteria standards. (cited in Symonds, 1993 , p. 17)

Both of these definitions stress the notion of *judgment of worth,* and for all intents and purposes are considered to be summative. The purpose of the evaluation is to sum up and then judge a performance. Manning (1988) compares the evaluation of teachers to the type of comprehensive evaluation strategies in the classroom.

> Good teaching involves, among other things, some type of preassessment in order that instructional strategies may be devised. Then, as instruction progresses, various sampling processes are employed to assess learning, to reteach, or to alter the instructional procedures. Finally, an initial test may result in some reteaching. At the conclusion of the instruction, a test to make final decisions about grading, placement, or promotion is administered; this final test is the summative test. There is little or no expectancy that the summative test will have an impact upon the learning. (p. 3)

In Manning's description, the final test used to make a decision regarding a student's progress is the *summative* portion of the evaluation process. A teacher would expect little impact on the learning of the student using only a summative method of assessment. It is fair to conclude that a similar lack of impact would occur for a teacher involved only in a summative process. The preassessment, sampling and initial testing, are strategies used to change or improve the performance of students. These

can be compared to the *formative* evaluation of teachers. The same notion of ongoing feedback for improvement is found in Dagley and Orso's (1991) definition of supervision as a "developmental process that includes efforts designed to improve the instructional behavior of the individual teacher" (p. 71). These activities involve reflection on present performance with the goal being improvement or growth.

In summary, teacher evaluation can be divided into two broad categories; summative and formative. Summative evaluation is a judgment and decision based model in which a supervisor or superior is responsible for judging the performance. Criteria in this model are determined without input from the teacher. Formative evaluation or supervision is concerned with feedback for the purpose of improvement. In this model the teachers are responsible for judging their own performance and play an active role in determining criteria.

Formative Versus Summative Evaluation

Formative and summative evaluation processes are implemented to move a school closer to the goal of improved teacher performance and student outcomes. These two evaluation processes differ greatly in practice and implementation, but more importantly they differ in the theoretical and philosophical assumptions upon which they are based. Through an examination of the basic underlying belief systems of the participants an initial understanding of the differences can be addressed.

> Notions of evaluation are shaped by and reflect views of teaching and pedagogy. Embedded within the *dominant* [emphasis added] form of teacher evaluation is the assumption that teaching is a commodified product in which expert teachers deposit the "right" information into the heads of students. From this authoritarian, "banking" notion it follows that school "problems" can be corrected by what teachers do. (Gitlin & Smyth, 1989, p. 25)

This *dominant* form of evaluation, which is referred to by Gitlin and Smyth (1989), is summative. To understand the purpose of an evaluation process, it is important to understand how the evaluator views teaching. In Gitlin and Smyth's (1989) example teaching is seen as *a commodified product*. If this is known and understood, then it follows logically that to correct school problems, one must correct the teachers. This is accomplished expediently through a summative evaluation process. It is not satisfactory simply to understand the philosophical assumptions of the evaluator, those being evaluated must also have an opportunity to explore and share their beliefs. Barber (1984) suggested that if this is not allowed to occur problems can result. Barber stated:

> The problem occurs as a result of lack of congruence between an evaluator's philosophical belief about man [sic], his knowledge of evaluation theory, and his application of that theory to a personnel evaluation system. Each of these concepts must be congruent with the others before individuals will cooperate with an evaluation system that purports to help them become better teachers or administrators. (p. 80)

Barber (1984) made assumptions regarding the relationship among theory and practice, philosophical beliefs, and summative and formative evaluation systems. Barber (1984) espoused that the practical aspects of evaluation systems are a result of theory which is based on the way in which the individual is perceived. The *control* by supervisors which is a large part of the summative evaluation system is based on a fundamental belief that individuals cannot and will not strive for excellence without an external supervisory scheme. (See Table 1).

This idea of congruence of beliefs is also presented by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) in this discussion of the philosophical orientations upon which McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y are based.

> Fundamental to Theory X is a philosophy of direction and control. This philosophy is administered in a variety of forms and rests upon a theory of motivation that is inadequate for most adults, particularly professional adults....Basic to theory Y is building identification and commitment to worthwhile objectives in the work context and building mutual trust and respect. (p. 16)

Table 1. Congruence of Philosophy, Theory and Practice in Evaluation

	Formative Evaluation	Summative Evaluation
Philosophy:	Each individual strives for excellence.	Individuals achieve excellence only if supervised or evaluated by others.
Theory:	Evaluations done to improve the performance of the individual. Reward or punishment should be decided internally.	Evaluation is done to improve the performance of the social system. Reward or punishment should be decided externally.
Practice:	Evaluate the process of instruction but not the person.	Evaluate the products of instruction as well as the process and the person.

(Barber, 1984, p. 80a).

In the example from Barber (1984) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), a clear link can be seen between the underlying assumptions regarding teachers and the teaching profession and the method of evaluation that is implemented. Administrators who believe that teachers will only attain competence through the rigid enforcement of rules, regulations and external controls will be unlikely to implement a formative evaluation policy. Teachers who are motivated to excellence will then feel that the system does nothing for their own growth; evaluation simply becomes *a hoop through which they must jump.*

Summative and formative systems also approach the task of improving teacher performance in fundamentally different ways. Stiggins (1986) described the manner in which the results are attained:

> Accountability systems strive to affect school quality by protecting students from incompetent teachers. However, because nearly all teachers are at least minimally competent, the accountability system affects only a few teachers who are not competent.
>
> Thus if the goal is to improve general school quality--and the use of only those strategies that affect a few teachers are implemented--overall school improvement is likely to be a very slow process.
>
> Growth-oriented systems, on the other hand, have the *potential* of affecting all teachers--not just those few who are having problems. There is no question that all teachers can improve some dimension(s) of their performance. (cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, pp. 2-3)

There is little doubt that the most effective and positive way to bring about school improvement is through encouraging teachers to develop better skills and techniques to be implemented in the classroom. This can best be achieved through the growth-

oriented or formative systems. Stiggins (1986) continued his discussion regarding the summative and formative systems and the way in which each *manages* the participation of teachers in each system.

> Accountability systems rely on (a) the requirement of law and contractual obligation to compel teachers to participate, and (b) the threat of personnel action to trigger growth when needed.
>
> The effect of required participation is clear. If teachers are not doing the job, they must change or leave the profession. If they are doing the job, there is no impact...
>
> But a growth-oriented system must manage the motivation issue differently and therefore, its impact on the individual varies. Since it is neither legal nor feasible to require all teachers to demonstrate skills above the level of minimum competence, participation in growth systems cannot be required for competent teachers.
>
> Teachers cannot be obliged to "attain excellence," however lofty such a goal might seem, because there is no universally acceptance of excellent performance. While standards of minimum competence can be defined and applied uniformly to all, standards of defining excellence vary markedly from context to context and teacher to teacher (Duke,1985).
>
> Motivation to participate in growth-oriented systems must come from within each teacher. For all teachers who can find that inner motivation, there is the promise of positive impact. (Stiggins, 1986, p. 54 as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, pp. 3-4)

Accountability systems, or summative systems will only allow schools to ensure that a minimal level of competence has been attained. If excellence is the goal for schools, teachers should be motivated, encouraged, and provided with opportunities to

continue to develop professionally. As outlined by Stiggins (1986) excellence cannot be mandated as can a minimal level of competence.

In summary, formative and summative systems differ on practical and philosophical levels. Often there is an incongruence between the philosophies held by the evaluator and the teacher. This incongruence can lead to failure within the process. Although both systems claim to improve instruction, summative systems achieve this through a *lowest common denominator* notion. Formative systems achieve this through the nurturance of excellence through professional growth. The management of teachers also varies between the two systems. Summative systems rely on the law and threat of job loss. Formative systems rely on the professionalism and internal motivation of teachers.

The Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The literature identifies a variety of objectives that can be met through a well organized and competently implemented teacher evaluation process:

1. Personnel decisions (Wise et al. 1985; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Dagley & Orso, 1991; Hickman,1992; Hickcox & Musella, 1989; Root & Overly, 1990; Valentine, 1988).

2. The implementation of professional growth activities (Hickcox & Musella, 1989; Root & Overly, 1990; Gordon, 1992).

3. The improvement of instruction by promoting professional development of teachers (Wise et. al., 1985; Stiggins & Duke,1988; Glatthorn, 1984; Frymier, 1988; Glickman, 1988; Dagley & Orso, 1992;

Wiles & Bondi, 1991; Bryant & Currin, 1995; DePasquale Jr., 1990; Gordon, 1992; Zahorik, 1992; Valentine, 1988).

4. The overall improvement of schools (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Glickman, 1988; Gitlin & Smyth, 1990; Gordon, 1992).

5. The reward of merit (Pennell & Firestone, 1993; Stiggins & Duke 1988; Hatry, Greiner & Ashford, 1994).

6. Teacher accountability (Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Hickcox & Musella, 1989; Gordon, 1992; Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy,1993).

7. Communication and sharing of community vision and goals through empowerment (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Glickman, 1988; McBride & Skau, 1995; Garvie, 1990; Zahorik, 1992; Gordon, 1992.

8. Collegiality (Garvie, 1990; Gitlin & Smyth, 1990; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Gordon, 1992).

9. Encourage critical reflection on practice (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993; Gitlin & Smyth, 1989).

Although there are a multitude of purposes for teacher evaluation, Valentine (1992), sums up what should be at the heart of any evaluation process.

> The ultimate goal in education should be to provide the best quality educational experiences for all students. Each process implemented in a school district should contribute toward accomplishing that goal. For an evaluation system to contribute to that goal, it must promote the professional development of each staff member. (p.1)

Summative Evaluation Models

The traditional approach to teacher evaluation, which is summative in form, sees teaching as *technical expertise* (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy 1993) or *neo-scientific management* (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). These assumptions are based on the view that teaching is a highly skilled activity and that the skills required to be successful can be identified and taught. It also assumes that within the organization there exists a *hierarchy* in which the *superiors* will *judge* the work of the *subordinates*. An assumption held by those who believe that evaluation should be done to ensure accountability is that without the evaluation process accountability will not be attained.

Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984) and Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985) summed up these traditional evaluation methods as follows:

> The evaluations of teacher performance carried out in most schools are brief, superficial, pro forma affairs involving a few moments of classroom observation every year or two followed by the completion of a required evaluation report form, which is signed by all interested parties and filed away never to be seen again. (cited in Stiggins & Duke, 1988 p. 1)

There exist a number of issues related to this traditional method of evaluation. One issue is the passive role that the teacher is forced to play within this evaluation model.

> For all intents and purposes, control of both the process and the report lies in the hands of the evaluator. It is not surprising, then, that teachers evaluated by such approaches express high levels of concern about the fairness issues and about the qualifications of the evaluator for the task. (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p. 5)

This *lack of voice* of the teacher is destructive of the trust, empowerment and collegiality that is occurring in effective schools (Bryant & Currin, 1995).

A second issue deals with the fairness and validity of this method of accountability based evaluation. Related to fairness are the criteria used and the subjectivity of the evaluator. First, evaluations are extremely subjective and evaluators cannot be seen as objective. "Teacher evaluators are assumed to operate with filters. They use a mental structure to cope with and process the huge amounts of data present in any classroom observation" (Bryant & Currin, 1995, p. 252). The evaluators' perceptions of a teacher-student interaction will be based on experiences from the evaluators' paradigms. If they have not had similar classroom experiences as the teacher being observed or do not understand the context of the specific teacher-student relationship, their judgment of the situation could be incorrect. Second, in the view of teaching as a technical process, often the contextual aspects of individual classrooms and students are overlooked. What may be effective practice with one group of students may not be as successful for others. Third, is the issue of criteria. Hickcox (1993), identifies criteria as the major problem in traditional evaluation approaches. He categorized the problems as: (a) difficulty in measuring, (b) lack of relationship between criteria and student learning, and (c) the use of overt or hidden checklists (Hickcox, 1993). Related to the actual criteria is lack of standardization of those criteria. Hickcox (1993) asks "...how many negative checks would it take to result in dismissal? There

may be twenty-five items on the check list, or maybe a hundred...who could do all of those things and still be human?" (p. 5).

Problems with teacher evaluation policies relating to low teacher and administrator morale are a reality (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Frymier, 1990; Barber, 1984). Differentiation of evaluation models needs to be considered by educators. "A teacher evaluation model that emphasized technical competencies was welcomed by beginning teachers, but was considered inadequate in providing for professional growth of experienced teachers" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p. ii).

In summary, the summative evaluation model is surrounded by many issues. These issues bring into question the effectiveness of this model's ability to improve the level of instruction in schools. If the goal is to improve the quality of education by assuring a basic level of competency exists, how expediently will school and individual improvement occur? Summative evaluation does meet a bureaucratic need in schools, but it should not be implemented as the only model.

Formative Supervision Models

There exists a multitude of evaluation processes which encourage professional growth. These include peer assessment, self-evaluation, and collaborative professional development. "Rather than supposed experts passing judgments about teaching, these alternative more educative approaches are based on a dialogical relationship in which two [or more] participants work together to arrive at a negotiated assessment of teaching and what it means" (Gitlin & Smyth, 1990, p.27).

Formative evaluation models are often based on one of two metaphors of teaching, teaching "as an art" or teaching "as professional judgment" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993). Teaching as an art holds that "teaching is highly individualistic, dependent on the personal resources of the teacher and on his or her interactions with students individually and as a class" (Wise et al., 1985; Gitlin, 1989,

Gitlin & Goldstein, 1987; Gitlin & Smyth, 1990; Smyth, 1988; as cited in Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p. 7). This metaphor assumes that the teaching process is more complex and dynamic than can be addressed by observable, measurable skills. It accepts that effective teaching is contingent on the personality of the teacher and the relationship which is built between teacher and student. The assurance of accountability must take a new form because a checklist for these relational qualities cannot be devised. It is not that accountability is not of importance, but that "it is viewed as responsibility in the Kerr (1987) sense: Teachers demonstrate their responsibility to the public by being critically reflective about their teaching and constantly seeking ways to improve" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993 ,p. 8). Teachers involved in these models of evaluation are given a voice and are actively involved in the process. Evaluation is no longer something that is *done to them* but *done with them* or *done by them.*

Related to the metaphor of teaching as art is that of teaching as professional judgment. This metaphor is a *hybrid* of teaching as an art and teaching as technical expertise. It accepts that a body of theoretical knowledge exists, as in teaching as technical expertise, but it also recognizes the individualistic, contextualized, relational aspects of teaching as presented in the teaching as art metaphor. Accountability within this system is summed up by Darling-Hammond (1989):

> Professional accountability assumes that, since teaching is too complex to be hierarchically prescribed and controlled, it must be structured so that practitioners can make responsible decisions, both individually and collectively....Professionals learn from each other, norms are established and transmitted, problems are exposed and tackled, parents' concerns are heard, and students' needs are better met. (p. 78, as cited in Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy, 1993, p. 11)

Teachers involved in evaluation based on teaching as professional judgment, are involved in the critical reflection on their teaching. Although this can take many different forms, most often it occurs in a quasi-clinical supervision model, consisting of goal setting, observation and open two-way discussion. Unlike the teaching as technical expertise perspective, the teacher and collaborator are seen as equally important in the process.

Issues related to formative models often surround the demands placed on the administrator in a variety of ways that the traditional model does not. No longer can a checklist be devised and implemented. Often the data collection procedures become more sophisticated and in-depth than those in the summative models. Stiggins and Duke (1988) stated:

> In our studies, the case studies revealed that growth-- producing evaluations tend to be based on criteria and standards that are appropriate for the individual context and capabilities of each teacher; endorsed by the teachers as important for them; and informative about the degree to which each teacher's professional goals have been attained. (p. 87)

Professional trust must be built to ensure that open communication can occur between peers and between teacher and administrator. The *superior-subordinate* roles are no longer important. The development of a trusting relationship is integral to the formative model as " the ability to inspire trust is important for those who would presume to suggest changes in teacher behavior" (Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 85). McBride and Skau (1995) suggest a number of characteristics of relationships within schools that foster a trusting climate. "Relations built upon confidentiality, consistency, risk taking, honesty, security and a climate of mutual exchange promote the development of trust" (p.264). Trust is integral for the professional autonomy of teachers to choose and be responsible for their own professional development.

> The partners within supervisory relationships in the heterocentic community must expect open communication and sensitivity to one another's data, ideas, perceptions, and feelings. Teachers must believe, for example, that the purpose of classroom visits is clear and that they own the resulting data or written observations. Teachers must believe that they can question the supervisor's understandings and can present the classroom milieu from their own perspectives. Beyond the supervisory relationship, the members of the group should strive to be open, listen actively, and share information. (McBride & Skau, 1995, p. 265)

Time and resources should be available for teachers and administrators to organize and pursue professional development goals. Wise et al. (1985) stated:

> The failure to concentrate resources will result in unfocused evaluation that consumes resources but produces information that serves neither teacher nor administrators....The failure to achieve accuracy and fairness will destroy the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation system. When costs are perceived to outweigh benefits, the process fails. (p.110, as cited in Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p.15)

A congruence appears to exist between the theory and philosophy surrounding formative models and effective schools characteristics. The missing link is the implementation of these beliefs into action. "The challenge then becomes to create an educational community that encourages peer observation, dialogical conversation, and critical self-reflection within the framework of schools as they currently exist with their hierarchical relationships and teacher isolation" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p. 9).

Formative models are based on a different view of teaching and teachers than summative models. Unlike the summative models, formative models are based on the assumption that a level of professionalism exists in teachers and that they are intrinsically motivated to improve instruction. Competence exists; excellence becomes the goal. Teachers are viewed as active partners in the process. Open dialogue, trust, empowerment, and equity play a large role in these processes.

Rationale for Change

The necessity for change in teacher evaluation practices can be separated into two broad categories; the inadequacies of the implementation of the traditional evaluation process and the change in the nature of schools and educational philosophy.

Inadequacies of the Traditional, Summative Process. The implementation of a traditional, summative process exclusively, does not appear to be meeting the needs of all teachers. "While some policies had complicated procedures for formative and summative evaluations, these distinctions tended to be ignored in practice" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993, p. 298). It has been, for the most part, the decision of the administrator/supervisor to decide whether an evaluation would be summative or formative. As a result, summative processes are typically implemented because they meet the legal and accountability needs of school districts. "Past teacher evaluation practices while ostensibly meeting public and district demands for fiscal accountability and providing tangible 'proof' of school and teacher effectiveness, have not been well regarded by teachers" (Fitzgerald & Muth, 1984, as cited in Gray, McLaughlin & Bialozor, 1992, p. 26). Issues such as the subjectivity of the supervisor, lack of criteria which are uniformly implemented, and lack of teacher participation have been discussed earlier.

A final issue surrounding the inadequacies of the traditional, summative evaluation model deals with feedback. Root and Overly (1990) asserted that:

> Evaluation should provide feedback to teachers on what teaching processes have been effective and direction for improving instruction. Yet, teachers often voice concern that evaluation by administrators is of little help to them in improving teaching or solving an instructional problem. (pp. 34-35)

The importance of feedback in teacher evaluation is echoed by McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988). "Feedback, the process of giving back information for the purpose of bringing change in the behavior of those receiving the information, sits at the heart of any teacher evaluation effort (p. 47). Yet in a summative system, feedback is often supplied to the teacher in written form at the end of the year when there is little opportunity to use the information for improvement. The authors continued and suggested that " the teacher evaluation activities we observed join with the general literature on organizational behavior to suggest that effective feedback must have the following characteristics: (a) timeliness, (b) specificity, (c) credibility, and (d) intent (perceived non punitive)" (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988, p. 47).

For many teachers in the summative process, feedback received meets none of these characteristics. It is difficult to accept that the imposition of the summative evaluations process on competent tenured teachers continues to be implemented in schools, when it has been less than stellar in producing effective results.

Changing Nature of Schools. Inherent in this traditional system is the notion of a supervisor who has superior knowledge, and a subordinate who will be judged. It is no longer acceptable to use a *superior-subordinate* relationship in the evaluation process. "The movement toward learner-centered schools, with its emphasis on

teacher decision making and cooperative problem solving, implies necessary changes in traditional teacher evaluation practices" (Bryant & Currin, 1995, p. 251).

Guba and Lincoln (1989), identified a number of flaws with this traditional evaluation method. They found this model to possess the following qualities:

1. A reification of managerialism, in which the manager stands outside the process and makes judgments about the work of the teacher.

2. A manager-oriented evaluation system disempowers those being evaluated by affording them no voice in the analysis of their practice.

3. Managers tend to exercise editorial rights over information, a practice that, when applied to teacher evaluation, silences teacher voice in the construction of experience.

4. A manager-oriented evaluation promotes the evaluatee (the teacher to collude with the evaluator (administrator) in order to stay on the evaluator's good side, a practice that is calculated to result in no change of behavior. (as cited in Bryant & Currin, 1995, p. 251)

Gordon (1992) described the changing belief systems in education and its need to be reflected in teacher evaluation policies. "The paradigm shift discussed here actually consists of a whole series of changes in beliefs about leadership, teachers, and change itself. It involves transitions in beliefs concerning six different areas relative to educational supervision" (p. 64). (See Table 2).

Change within the area of teacher evaluation will only occur when the philosophical and theoretical influences of empowerment and collaboration within the

teaching community are allowed to affect the area of evaluation (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993 and McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988).

Gordon (1992) believed this change must occur from *within* the teaching process, and in a grass roots manner.

> The conversion likely will be caused by a combination of exposure to the new supervision and successful application of the new model to problems that the old supervision has been repeatedly unable to solve. The paradigm shift from the old to the new supervision, if it takes place, will be gradual in the sense that over time, increasing numbers of individuals will experience such conversions, and those committed to the new supervision will gradually become the majority (Gordon, 1992, p. 76).

Table 2. The Shifting Paradigm in Supervision

Old Supervision	**New Supervision**
Control	Empowerment
Separate Functions	Integrated Functions
Sameness	Diversity
Occasional Supervisor	Continuous Collegial Support
Assistance	Networks
Applied Science	Professional Inquiry
Mechanical Change	Organic Change

Gordon (1992, p. 66)

In summary teacher evaluation practices need to change. Failure of the traditional summative model to meet the developmental needs of competent tenured teachers, and changes in the philosophical underpinnings of our educational systems, illustrate the need for the development of a more responsive, developmental model of teacher evaluation.

Basic Conditions for an Effective Evaluation System

What is required for an effective system? Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983) specify four minimal conditions for successful evaluation systems:

1. All individuals in the system understand the criteria and processes for teacher evaluation;

2. All participants understand how these criteria and processes relate to the basic goals of the organization; i.e., there is a shared sense that the criteria reflect the most important aspects of teaching, that the evaluation system is consonant with their educational goals and conceptions of teaching;

3. Teachers perceive that the evaluation procedure enables and motivates them to improve their performance;

4. All individuals in the evaluation perceive that the evaluation procedure allows them to strike a balance "between adaptation and adaptability, between stability to handle present demands and flexibility to handle unanticipated demands (Weick, 1982, p. 674). That is, it allows participants to achieve a balance between control and autonomy. (as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 8)

These conditions allow for flexibility and adaptability between schools and personnel, yet should be considered to be the backbone of any effective teacher supervision policy.

The Use of Incentives Programs

The literature reviewed reported problems and potential benefits arising from the implementation of incentive programs such as merit pay and career ladders. Stiggins and Duke (1988) claimed that the use of incentive programs "rest[s] on the assumption that sound, effective evaluation procedures can be devised" (p.1). It is difficult enough to devise evaluation procedures which separate competent from incompetent teachers. It would seem almost an impossibility to have a procedure that would effectively rank teachers as exceptional and average.

Hatry, Greiner, and Ashford (1994) identified the following as some of the negative consequences resulting from the implementation of incentive programs.

> The criticisms and negative program outcomes reported included the following: (1) significant teacher morale problems arose, including increased competition which caused divisiveness and had a negative impact on the information sharing among teachers; (2) some teachers were upset at not receiving awards they felt they deserved...(3) the use of quota on the number of teachers who could receive awards...(4) the program often cost too much and was too time-consuming for school administrators, especially programs requiring supervisory evaluations; and (5) many of the benefits of the merit pay programs were short-lived and tended to subside after two or three years of program use. (p. 233)

Firestone and Pennell (1993) concluded the following in their study entitled *Teacher Commitment, Working Conditions, and Differential Incentive Policies*:

> First, the competitive aspects of such policies often undermine teacher commitment. These aspects include selection mechanisms that pit individual against individual (and to a lesser extent individuals against a fixed standard) as well as incentives that increase the stakes in winning. Increased competition raises serious concerns about fairness that undermines the intrinsic rewards of teaching and the modest learning opportunities that already exist in schools. Competition also reduces teacher autonomy by using feedback mechanisms for selection purposes rather than as a consequence-free source of information about performance. (pp. 517-518)

However, Firestone and Pennell (1993) stated that with some incentive programs especially those involving career ladders, mentor programs and other differentiated roles for teachers that "collective incentives can enhance collaboration by redirecting competition from the individual to the school level" (p. 518). Other benefits such as reduced rate of teacher turnover and absenteeism, teachers becoming goal oriented, improvement in the performance of average teachers and encouragement for teachers to become more innovative, were reported by Hatry, Grenier and Ashford (1994).

In summary, incentive programs should be approached with care. The lack of a valid measuring tool for excellence in teaching is one of the greatest drawbacks to these programs. Although some benefits can arise from such programs, there exists a danger of creating many more problems for teachers and schools.

Change in Teacher Evaluation: From Theory to Practice

How is the gap between theory related to teacher evaluation and the practice to be bridged? Needless to say, a change must occur, but it must be the *right* type of change. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), describe this difference as follows:

> Change takes place at two levels-- the way things look and the way things actually work. Changes at the first level are *structural*, resulting in altered arrangements. Changes at the second level are *normative*, resulting in altered beliefs (Fullan & Stiegelbaurer, 1991). When only first-level changes are introduced in schools it may appear that things are being done differently, but results seem not to be effected, at least not for a long time. (p. 81)

For the most part, changes in teacher evaluation policy and practice have been at the structural level. With no change or congruence in belief systems, there is nothing to sustain the change, and failure occurs. "What is needed is top-down pressure and support for bottom-up involvement [and]...a perceptive sense of timing when to switch" (Grimmet, 1987, p. 28).

Before all else, it should be accepted that the changes must occur first at a philosophical level or they will never be manifest in practice. "For most school districts, effecting the organizational conditions necessary for successful introduction and conduct of a strong evaluation system--creating a climate for evaluation--requires change in deeply held values and fundamental modification in the behavioral strategies that characterize institutional activity" (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988, p. 5). Second, this movement must also involve the teacher in a "bottom-up" staff development model; starting and ending with the teacher (Bond & Dyksta , 1967; Edmunds & Fredrickson, 1979; Fisher, Berliner, Marliave, Chen & Dishaw, 1980; Purkey & Smith, 1983; as cited in Neil, 1988, p. 17).

The failure of teacher evaluation systems to change may be due to the fact that structural and not normative changes are occurring in our schools.

In summary, teacher evaluation falls into two broad categories: summative evaluation and formative evaluation. Both summative and formative evaluation models attempt to improve the level of instruction in our schools, yet approach the task in very different ways. In a formative model, the underlying assumption is that teaching is a complex, relational activity that cannot be captured by a skills list. Accountability in these systems is entrusted to the teacher. It is expected that teachers are professional, critical of their performance and are constantly striving to improve. Formative models strive to improve instruction in schools by providing opportunities for teachers' professional growth.

Summative models assume that teachers cannot be trusted to improve on their own. They often involve set criteria, assuming that good teaching is highly skilled and that skills required to be successful can be identified, taught, and observed. Summative models are important for teacher personnel decisions, but do not meet the needs of tenured teachers. Improvement through these summative models is accomplished by ensuring a basic level of competency in the teaching force.

By listening to teachers, a more responsive, relevant evaluation system can be devised and implemented. This new supervision would be one which incorporates the ideas of empowerment, collegiality, and trust into the evaluation process and accepts teachers as being professionals. Commitment to teacher evaluation which accepts teachers as professionals as *superordinate* not *subordinate* to their work system, require changes to occur first at the philosophical and theoretical levels.

Chapter Three

Research Method

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of tenured teachers in regards to summative and formative models of teacher evaluation. Specifically, the purpose was to investigate the link between the method of teacher evaluation and teachers' percieved professional growth. The intent of the study was to provide a *rich description* of the experiences of tenured teachers with teacher evaluation and to analyze their responses.

Type of Study

The study was conducted in the naturalistic, interpretative paradigm and made use of data collected from tenured teachers. In particular the research was aimed at determining teachers' perceptions toward either formative and/or summative evaluation models. As this study dealt with perceptions, it was decided that the depth of information required would best be accessed through the use of interviews.

> The interview situation usually permits much greater depth than the other methods of collecting research data....The skilled interviewer through the careful motivation of the subject and maintenance of rapport, can obtain information that the subject would probably not reveal under any other circumstances. (Borg and Gall, 1989, pp. 446-447)

The interviews were semi-structured which allowed them to be guided in part by the participants' responses. This type of interview was chosen as it "provides a desirable combination of objectivity and depth" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 452). Interview questions are located in Appendix A.

Research Instrument

The construction of the interview guide was developmental and took place over a number of months. Initially, the interview questions were developed and refined through continued review of the literature, discussions with colleagues and the researcher's own experience as a classroom teacher. This interview guide was then tested and refined through a pilot study. Discussion of changes that occurred following the pilot study are presented below in the section entitled "Pilot Study."

The potential weaknesses of research based on interviews was investigated by the researcher and this helped to alleviate the threat of obvious bias. "The flexibility, adaptability, and human interaction that are unique strengths of the interview also allow subjectivity and possible bias that in some research situations are its greatest weakness" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 448). A number of factors called *response effects* have the possibility of contributing to bias. Knowledge of the potential sources of error, careful planning and selection of questions and volunteers assisted in reducing the potential effects of bias.

Weiss (1975) describes three potential sources of error that can be present in interview based research (cited in Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 448). These three are summed up as: (a) predispositions of the respondent, (b) predispositions of the interviewer and (c) errors related to conducting the study.

Predispositions of the respondent dealt directly with the volunteers in the study, their attitudes, comfort and ability to respond to the researcher's questions. The possibility existed that respondents may have wanted to present themselves in favorable terms. As some of the respondents were former colleagues, there may have been a propensity to respond in such a way as to be seen in a favorable manner by the researcher. This threat was reduced through the use of questions which focused on perceptions of the process of teacher evaluation, not the end result. The assurances of

confidentiality may have also alleviated the pressure that some respondents may have felt to be overly supportive of their evaluators.

The second threat dealt with the predispositions of the interviewer. The subject of the research question, teacher evaluation, is one in which the researcher has had unfavorable experiences. This created a situation in which the researcher's preconceived notions or negative opinions regarding teacher evaluation had the potential of influencing what was heard and discussed in the interviews. This threat was lessened by tape-recording the interviews and then transcribing these verbatim. This gain in objectivity is one of the main factors for obtaining a taped record of the interview (Borg & Gall, 1989). In this manner, all interaction between the respondent and researcher was recorded and available for analysis. The use of an interview guide also ensured that the same basic questions were presented to the respondents. The experience gained through the pilot study allowed the researcher to become more comfortable with the respondents in the interview setting as well as to practice setting rapport.

The final potential source of error as described by Weiss (1975) dealt with the procedures used in conducting the study (cited in Borg and Gall, 1989). The use of standardized consent forms, and semi-structured interviews lessened the threat. (See Appendixes A and B). The length and location of the interviews varied from respondent to respondent, but these factors were always determined by the respondents and not the researcher. In all of the interviews only the respondent and the interviewer were present.

To assist in the accuracy of the coding process, a colleague had an opportunity to read the transcripts and categorize themes. In this manner, the veracity of the researcher's categories were assessed.

Description of the Sample

The target population for this research was tenured teachers in Alberta. As the researcher had limited time and resources, volunteer teachers from the Greater Edmonton Area constituted the accessible population. Contacts with previous administrators and colleagues supplied a comprehensive list of possible subjects from a large urban school jurisdiction. In addition contacts were made through my advisor to a local sub-urban school district provided another source of possible respondents.

Potential participants were contacted directly and by mail to describe the purpose, depth of the study, and to gauge their willingness to participate. Identification of the participants was done using the following criteria. Respondents had to:

1. Be currently teaching,
2. Have tenure with the school jurisdiction with whom they were currently employed,
3. Have had either a summative only or summative / formative combination evaluation in the current teaching year.

A total of ten interviews were conducted. Although it could be argued that this is a small sample size, Borg and Gall (1989) stated: "...a study that probes deeply into the characteristics of a small sample often provides more knowledge than a study that attacks the same problem by collecting only shallow information on a large sample" (pp. 236-237).

Characteristics of the Respondents

Ten interviews were conducted in total. Two of the ten interviews constituted the pilot study. All teachers interviewed had a minimum of five years teaching experience. Of the ten respondents interviewed eight were female and two were male. Three of the ten teachers had taught in more than one school jurisdiction. All respondents had either taught at a variety of locations or had taught with more than one administrator.

Two of the teachers were working part-time in a job sharing situation. Two of the respondents combined teaching with part time administrative roles in their schools. (See Table 1).

Determination of Summative and Formative Categories

Categorizing the respondents into summative and formative groups required a great deal of consideration. As all of the teachers were involved in very similar processes and all but two were expecting to receive a summary of their evaluation, a closer examination of what constitutes a formative process as opposed to a summative process was undertaken. Two sets of criteria were used to categorize the respondents as either being summatively or formatively evaluated. First, an examination of criteria was undertaken. Stiggins and Duke (1988) stated:

> In our studies, the case studies revealed that growth - producing evaluations tend to be based on criteria and standards that are appropriate for the individual context and capabilities of each teacher; endorsed by the teachers as important for them; and informative about the degree to which each teacher's professional goals have been attained. (p. 87)

Related to the description above, was the question as to whether the criteria were externally generated and imposed on the teachers, as is the case in a summative model, or collaboratively generated by supervisors and teachers or selected by the teachers themselves, as is the case in a formative model.

A second criteron used to categorize the respondents was that of teacher perception. McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) stated: "The effectiveness of any teacher evaluation system--its ability to promote genuine accountability, its ability to contribute valid, reliable information to teachers' improvement--depends finally on the responses of those being evaluated, the teachers" (p.4).

Table 3 Characteristics of Respondents

Teacher	Position in School	Type of Supervision	Years of Experience	Years of Tenure
Carla*	Division 1	Summative	9	8
Vera*	Division 2 Art and Science	Summative	14	14
Norm	Division 4 Computers Social Studies	Summative	15	12
Kelly	Division 3	Summative	15	2
Lillith	Division 3 Special Ed.	Summative	5	5
Diane	Kindergarten	Summative	10	10
Rebecca	Division 3 Language Arts	Formative	26	26
Sam	Division 3 Science	Formative	9	8
Fraser	Division 2	Formative	>16	>16
Cliff	Division 2 Acting Princ. Challenge Teacher Counselor	Formative	>17	>17

*Pilot study participant.

The respondents who were categorized as being formatively evaluated were knowledgeable and accepting of the criteria, had worked with their supervisors to determine the criteria in some cases, and found the process to be useful in attainment of their professional goals.

Those respondents categorized into the summative category, did not perceive the process to assist in attainment of their professional goals. For some of these respondents, there were no observations by their supervisor and therefore they were unaware of what criteria their performance would be judged against. Teachers categorized as summatively evaluated also questioned the ability of the supervisor to understand their individual contexts within the school.

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted from March to June, 1995. The teachers were asked to sign a consent form (Appendix B) which assured confidentiality. Interviews ranged from 25 to 60 minutes in length. An interview guide of 15 open-ended questions on teacher evaluation structured the interviews. All interviews were audio tape-recorded and then transcribed to print form. Notes were also taken to assist in clarifying ideas or revisiting important points. Only data which addressed the teacher evaluation process and its link to professional growth are presented in this document. As it was imperative to ensure understanding to the teachers' meaning of key concepts, teachers were asked to clarify or elaborate on statements. The number of these used varied from interview to interview depending on the interviewer's understanding. Probes used included: "What do you mean by...?" "Can you tell me a bit more about...?" Respondents were allowed as much time as they required to answer fully each question.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data involved several steps. The initial step involved transcribing the recorded interviews into print form. All tapes were transcribed in full. Respondents had the opportunity to review these transcriptions to ensure the intent of their responses was captured and to indicate any information they wished be deleted.

The second step in the analysis of the data was multi-faceted and included a review of the transcripts in search of topics which were descriptive of the teachers' experiences with teacher evaluation. As the interviews were semi-structured, that is a list of questions were prepared and used at each interview, it was inevitable that many of the topics were predetermined. However, the interviews were open ended and some new insights regarding teacher evaluation arose. Much of this information came from teachers' descriptions of their experiences with the evaluation process, past and present.

Subsequently for those themes and concepts that did not fit into the pre-existing categories, an inductive approach was used to create new thematic categories. This dual analysis approach ensured that none of the data collected were overlooked. A colleague also had an opportunity to read the transcripts and categorize themes to increase the reliability of analysis.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in early 1995 to test interview questions and method of data analysis. The pilot study proved to be a useful tool in the preparation of the main research project. Perhaps the greatest benefit of the pilot study was the experience the researcher gained from working through the entire research process on a small scale. The experience allowed a great deal of self-evaluation of the methods of both recording and analyzing the data.

During the initial interview, it became obvious that some difficulties with effective communication skills existed. This was evident in the interview questions that were being posed and with the interview procedure itself. Following the initial interview of the pilot study, many leading questions were identified. "A leading question is any question that, because of its phrasing, leads the respondent to consider one reply more desirable than another" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 463). Changes were made to allow for more open-ended responses. This in turn allowed teachers to share more of their perceptions of teacher evaluation, and lessened the effect of researcher bias.

A second area of difficulty identified by the pilot study involved the definition and understanding of terms. Teacher evaluation, supervision and performance appraisal are often used interchangeably. However, for some of the respondents, it became obvious that they would use specific terms depending on the type of process in which they were involved. To alleviate any possible misunderstandings, the researcher asked the respondents to identify which term they used and to explain their rationale. In this manner, both the respondent and the researcher shared a common frame of reference.

In the area of interviewing skills, the researcher realized a propensity to complete sentences and thoughts for the respondents existed. Active listening skills needed to be developed. Strategies for achieving this include the use of wait time, 20 seconds after the respondents has stopped talking, and the use of paraphrasing to ensure that the respondents' intent had been understood and to demonstrate to the respondent that their ideas were heard and understood. These two strategies proved helpful during interviews for the main study.

Analyzing and synthesizing the data for the pilot was a complex process. Strategies to deal with organizing the data on a small scale were helpful when analyzing data for the main study. Common theme sections were highlighted with different colors cut and charted accordingly. This method proved invaluable from a visual learner perspective.

The pilot study allowed the researcher the opportunity to find errors and weaknesses in method, as well as discover analytical and organizational techniques which fit the researcher's cognitive style in the analysis and synthesis of the data. Substantively, the pilot study caused the addition of two additional questions to the interview schedule. These questions dealt with the use of incentive policies for *excellent* teachers, and having teacher define the term they feel best described their experiences with the evaluation process.

In summary, the use of interviews as a data collection method was chosen because of the in-depth and personal responses that the research question required. The threat of researcher bias through response effect was identified and steps taken to lessen those effects. The sample, although small, was representative of teachers who had experience in a variety of grade levels, and with a wide variety of experiences with teacher evaluation. The purpose of this study was not to generalize. It was expected, however, that many of the experiences shared by the respondents would resonate with the experiences of teachers both within and without the districts represented here. The pilot study allowed for testing of both the interview questions and process as well as data analysis. This too, strengthened the final research as many potential problems were identified.

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussion

The following chapter will focus on a description and discussion of the findings derived from the analysis of the data collected in this study. The analysis will be presented in three sections: (a) findings and discussions related to the pilot study, (b) findings and discussions related to the main research study, and (c) responses to the research questions.

Pilot Study Findings and Discussion

For the purpose of the pilot study, two tenured teachers involved in a summative model of teacher evaluation were interviewed. As the data were analyzed and coded, a number of recurring themes emerged. The data from the interviews identified several areas in the summative process that were problematic. These included: (a) lack of clarity and description of the process, (b) limited teacher participation in the process, and (c) feedback that was neither timely nor useful for the teachers' professional growth. These two respondents also spoke of wanting the evaluation system to be more responsive to their needs and to become a framework for professional development.

Lack of Clarity. Each of the respondents was asked, "Can you tell me about the evaluation or supervision or performance appraisal process at your school?" In both cases the responses demonstrated a lack of clear information regarding the process. This lack of communication created an imbalance as the control and power lay solely in the hands of the evaluator as described by Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly & Ratsoy, 1993 and Barber 1984.

Vera stated:

> I don't feel that I have been evaluated on my performance, although I did get a performance review in June of last year. I mean I have not had the principal in my classroom observing me teach. I feel that maybe I should be evaluated. But I just feel she has more important things to do.

A similar comment was made by Carla. "There was no mention of visitation or, I think, even regular checks on how you are doing with the students. We were kind of just, basically vague on evaluation."

The statement made by Vera describing that she had not been evaluated and Carla referring to the process as "vague" infers that there was a lack of communication as to what the evaluation process would entail. It appeared that both teachers expected that part of the process would include at least one formal observation by the principal over the course of the school year. For these two teachers, clear communication of the process had not occurred. Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983), claimed that one of the four minimal conditions for any successful teacher evaluation system is that all participants understand the criteria and the processes and in these situations this condition had not been met (cited in Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

The Limited Role of the Teacher. When the respondents were asked to explain their role in the process both mentioned briefly an initial conference with the principal called a "one-on-one." This appeared to be the only time that they were actively involved in the process. Carla described the pre-observation conference as follows:

> Where the principal wanted to see us during our prep time or before school, after school, noon hours. So there was a half hour block or an hour block that we got to go in with our own agenda. I saw my principal in December, I think, that was when we had our first one-on-one.

When probed regarding whether this meeting dealt with any information regarding classroom visitations or timelines, the respondent said it did not. It is interesting that this conference was seen to be linked to the evaluation process even though no discussion regarding the process was evident.

Carla responded as follows to the question regarding teacher involvement in the process:

> No, I didn't really feel, I guess, it was an involvement on my part. I guess when our principal didn't go into our classroom to see what kind of students we had, so we were looking kind of more in isolation of what we were doing.

Vera also mentioned a conference with the principal which she called a "one-on-one evaluation." She described the process as follows, "We just kind of talk about any concerns that I might have with children or anything that I need to do my job." When probed to find out if a discussion regarding the evaluation process was included in the meeting, Vera responded:

> We just talked about it a little bit. She says what kind of a teacher she feels I am and how I'm doing. She does get feedback from my partner. And I guess she's brought up a couple of times that she's never had any negative feedback from parents, which she feels doesn't hold a lot of weight but she feels like that's important too.

For these respondents, an invitation to participate in their evaluation process was given in the form of the "one-on-one" conference. However, neither teacher perceived

this constituted true involvement in the process and little information regarding the evaluation process was shared.

Feedback and Follow-up Conference. The teachers were asked to describe the process through which information about their evaluation was shared. In this situation both respondents appeared to be less than satisfied with the content of the feedback they received and the process in which it was shared. Neither of the respondents had the opportunity to meet with their supervisor to discuss their final written evaluation. With this crucial step missing, Vera and Carla were unable to share their perceptions of the evaluation. Vera stated when questioned about her feedback; "It was point form. I don't think it dealt with anything. You know I can barely remember it." Carla stated:

> Last year I received my evaluation in the mail during summer holidays. And so there was no talk about it. There was nothing that I felt the evaluation on my teaching style or what I did was good for the students in my class.

When Vera was asked if she thought the information that she received had had an effect on her own professional growth or on her classroom performance, she said "no."

In both situations the feedback was ineffective. In Carla's situation receiving the final report in the mail during the summer was not timely. "Timeliness is important because motivation to change as well as anxiety about outcomes are highest immediately following an evaluation session....Follow-up that comes weeks or months later is too late to be of any use" (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988,

p. 47). Vera was not able to recall the contents of her final report, which implies it had little impact on her professional development.

The criteria that were used to judge the performance of these teachers was externally imposed by the evaluator, and had not even been shared with them. This is supported by Hickcox (1993) who described the issue of criteria to be one of the major problems in the summative evaluation process.

Professional Development and the Evaluation Process. The interviewees were asked to describe any experience with teacher evaluation that differed from the process that was in place at their respective schools. Both teachers were able to describe a process which had the following common characteristics: (a) greater contact with the supervisor, (b) clear expectations regarding their role and the role of the supervisor, (c) a clear outline of the process, and (d) the sharing of data both in person and in written form. Although the two experiences varied greatly, both appeared to have influenced the teachers and their perceptions of the evaluation process.

Vera related an experience with formative supervision when she had been involved in a Teacher Effectiveness Program.

> I think I mentioned that the most meaningful and useful [evaluation process] was when I did the teacher effectiveness program....we might have a lesson on a specific skill and we'd practice that skill. But then I would get immediate feedback on that lesson. Then we would have a meeting right afterwards. I don't know, there was built in time....So then we would meet and go over my lesson.... And there was a time for me to say what I thought of the lesson and it was a learning process. It was pretty positive. But I think there were places, there were times when we did look at what I needed to improve.

Carla discussed her experience as follows:

> I had another administrator at the school and she set up her one-on-ones that there was an agenda. We had to give some thought before, and then we had to write out what our personal goal was, and academically what we were going to be getting better at. And then she set up a time where she was going to come into our classroom...She was taking notes on my presentation, what she saw, and saw the students working.

Carla continued with a description of the feedback she received:

> A written evaluation of what she saw, that would be just her notes that we would go through. And then she'd do a formalized one for our file....We had another one-on-one meeting to see if our goals had been met academically and personally. And at the end of the year she asked if we had met our goals. Like if I wanted to get better at math then I would go attend inservices and then we would just see if that was linked up together. When you got your written evaluation you had a chance to, I guess, if you didn't like some of the comments...at least you had an opportunity to maybe rectify or get more information on this.

What is similar regarding both of the experiences is that they dealt with professional development in different forms; the first a formalized program of professional development, the latter a more informal teacher generated program. A second commonality was the utility of the feedback form the supervisor. These two processes met the four minimum conditions described by Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983, as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988). The teachers understood

the criteria and process, there was an understanding of how the process would influence teaching, the teachers felt the process would enable them to improve and the teachers had some sense of autonomy and control in the process. Both teachers felt that the feedback held them accountable to their goals and was useful in attaining these goals. In both instances it appeared that the feedback met the four characteristics of effective feedback: (a) timeliness, (b) specificity, (c) credibility, and (d) with the intent to assist in growth. (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988).

An unexpected theme arose from one of the interviews. Carla felt strongly that evaluations of teachers should become more evaluative. She stated:

> I would like to see on the evaluation process that we are ranked as far as what we're doing to the children...I think it's time that we looked at evaluating our teachers as far as they're exceeding their expectations of their teaching. I don't think the evaluation process right now is anywhere near that and I would like it to be.

Carla's view regarding incentive programs appeared to have little support in the literature. Stiggins and Duke (1988) stated that until an effective and fair evaluation system can be devised, the use of incentive programs should not be implemented. Firestone and Pennell (1993) suggested that increasing the extrinsic rewards, as in the implementation of incentive programs, will lead to an undermining of teacher autonomy. Hatry, Greiner and Ashford (1994) reported that some of the negative outcomes due to the implementation of incentive programs included; morale problems, increased competition between teachers and teachers upset when they did not receive an award they felt they deserved.

Carla also referred to the notion of teacher evaluation as supplying positive feedback for teachers: "You know where you stand as a teacher. We all need our pats." This notion was supported by the findings in the *Toward Teacher Growth* document by Alberta Education. "Most teachers identified the most common benefit of teacher evaluation as the psychological pat on the back which confirmed that others valued their services" (Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy, 1993, p. 295).

In summary, the teachers interviewed for the pilot study showed dissatisfaction with the summative process. The imposition of a summative or traditional evaluation system on a competent, tenured teacher appears to be of little use to the evaluator, the teacher and the school jurisdiction as indicated by these respondents. The needs of tenured teachers were not being addressed. "Policies and procedures should include a different process for those teachers who have been judged competent with those few who have severe difficulties....It is simply common sense to suggest that common procedures cannot be applied across all categories of personnel except in the broadest sense" (Hickcox, 1993, p. 28).

A difference in perception was noticed however, when the teachers were involved in a process of which they were knowledgeable and the intent of the process was to learn and grow. The respondents perceived the process not as an evaluation or a judgment, but a process through which the administrator and teacher worked together to facilitate professional growth. Stiggins and Duke (1988) suggested a more collegial process which fostered professional development.

> During the years when these teachers [competent veterans] are not being evaluated for minimum competence, they are free to participate in professional development activities. To further encourage growth during these times, a policy may be needed to minimize or prevent formal documentation. Growth entails risk, and teachers may be more willing to

take risks if they know that evaluation will be private and undocumented. (p. 135)

Findings and Discussion From the Main Study

The main study consisted of interviews with eight tenured teachers. Of the eight teachers, four were involved in a formative or growth model and four in a summative or traditional model.

Surprisingly, a great deal of commonality existed in the process of teacher supervision that occurred between the two groups of teachers. It appeared that it was not the process per se, but the teacher's own perception and desire to learn from the process which determined whether professional growth occurred. For this reason, criteria for determining formative or summative categories were dependent on the teacher's own perception of the process and whether the evaluation criteria were externally imposed or collaboratively generated. A detailed description of the process is located in Chapter Three.

The following themes are presented: (a) teacher definition of their preferred term; (b) perception of the purpose of the process; (c) knowledge of the process including, goal setting procedures, data gathering techniques, and feedback; (d) the role of trust and respect between teacher and supervisor; (e) perceptions of incentive policies; and (f) proposed improvements to the process.

Definition of Preferred Term. Teachers involved in a formative model did not use the term evaluation to define the process. Cliff defined the process as follows: "The term I like best is clinical supervision...when you start involving someone in your own teaching, as I see it, they in fact are there to assist you." Cliff continues with his rationale:

> That's why I really like the term clinical supervision because both sides are moving with the data if they choose to, whereas if you're using some of these other terms [teacher evaluation, performance appraisals] I see it as really being very singular learning and very unilateral in terms of what you do with the information.

Fraser defined the process as follows: "I like the term teacher assessment....in assessment you are noting the good points, the positive areas, the areas that could perhaps use some polishing. And evaluation suggests the judgment of competencies being made."

Rebecca did not define the term she preferred, although she identified teacher supervision at her school as a "continuous process", and used the term "evaluation" to refer to the final report and not the process through which she went. Rebecca continued, "I view it as an opportunity for growth."

Sam chose the term performance appraisal and provided the rationale that in his situation the process was more than discrete observations. "It's performance as a teacher, but the performance in the building as well."

The respondents who were involved in the summative model had a tendency to have less specificity in their choice of terms. Diane stated: "It seems that principals have different titles for it and different expectations. And different labels for it. And so I tend to use whatever they're using that year." Norm defined the goals of the evaluation process as "the intent is to improve the individual....I think the reality is to meet the requirement of the Board."

No information regarding how teachers defined the process was located in the literature. However, it appeared that those teachers involved in the formative models desired more specificity in definitions. This may be due to a greater understanding in

the differentiation of the processes, or it may simply reflect that the teachers use the term that is currently "in vogue" within their school culture.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation. A discrepancy existed between the two categories of respondents regarding what they perceived to be the purpose of the process. From the "teacher growth" perspective, Cliff felt the process was integral in moving teachers toward excellence.

> It's [teacher supervision] not just a quantified objective measurement....It's room for discussion, room for some goals. And if you work from the premise that everyone who is a teacher is successful, let's find that and let's work with that and see how far we can go.

Also from the "teacher growth" perspective, Rebecca saw the process as being one of a partnership between administrator and teacher to encourage and assist personal and professional growth:

> I feel that in order for us, as teachers or individuals to grow, that we have to look beyond ourselves....I very much appreciate evaluations that I've received that have a target for growth, that suggests to me to continue working in some area or that a new direction that I could be looking at...I really feel that together we achieve more than I could individually achieve.

The respondents involved in the summative models felt the process was the proverbial hoop through which they had to jump. Norm summed up the purpose as being the timeless dichotomy between intent and reality. "I think the intent is to improve the individual...I think the reality is to meet the requirement of the Board."

Kelly stated that knowledge of the purpose is critical, but in her situation this knowledge was lacking. She stated:

> What I think is very important with it is when it's [teacher evaluation] done is that it has to be really clear as to what the purpose of it is so that someone doesn't walk into your class cold and collect information from their own perspective and walk away with it.

When questioned if this "snapshot" model had been her experience, Kelly responded it had. This lack of knowledge regarding the purpose or process of the evaluation model creates a climate of distrust toward the process which was reflected by this respondent. With this lack of trust, teachers do not discuss classroom performance openly (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988). Growth cannot occur expediently in an environment that does not include trust and open dialogue.

Teacher Knowledge of the Process. All teachers were asked to describe the process of teacher evaluation used at their current schools. Teachers who were involved in a formative system appeared to have a greater understanding of the goals, structure and roles and responsibilities in the process. Fraser described his opportunity to provide input into the development of teacher evaluation policy for his district.

> During the actual development of policy by the city, as a staff we went over every bit and every working copy so that there was definite input and reaction from staffs. Then of course, every staff member in this school is given an update of the policy handbook every year.

Fraser believed that this knowledge of the policy and process was important in order to monitor the competency of the teaching staff.

I think that if its a regular on-going routine within a system it means that if a teacher does deteriorate you have the tools and the policy set down so you can go in and help that teacher or encourage the teacher to take early retirement....But it means that again, because it is policy and because everyone is undergoing the same type of evaluation on a regular basis, it's part of our teaching career, it's non-threatening and it's non-controversial when it is your turn to be appraised. I think that's very important.

Fraser then described the actual process used at his school.
We [the administrator and teacher] sat down before, discussed what kinds of things we would like to have. I told him what I'd like to have him work with. We discussed in general what kinds of things we would like to note, if you wish observe....He visited the classroom.

This description of the process was similar for all of the teachers involved in a formative supervision system. All the processes contained the following components; goal setting with the administrator, observations (both formal and informal), the gathering of data from other sources, post observation conferences which also included discussion of goals and how they were being accomplished and a final written report. (See Table 4 for a comparison of the process components).

Generally there were similar components for teachers in the summative model. However, there was a great deal of inconsistency in the implementation of these components from teacher to teacher in the summative models. Three of the respondents, Norm, Diane, and Kelly reported that no classroom observations were conducted by their administrators. All four respondents in the summative category had no monitoring of the achievement of their professional growth goals by the supervisor in their schools. Kelly, when questioned about a final report stated: "I

really don't know. I don't think a lot of people know what happens because there's very poor communication."

This lack of communication was echoed by Diane. The fact that she was a new teacher at her school, and was not informed of the process, caused her a great deal of frustration:

> There was no written plan received from my principal regarding her actions for the year regarding teacher evaluation....I'm new at school this year. I don't know what her routines were. I got the impression she would be doing...walk throughs or walk-abouts some principals call them. And they just came into the classroom or whatever. I never saw her in my room unless it was, she came for a reason.

Kelly also felt that there was a great deal of inconsistency at the district level in regards to teacher evaluation expectation. "I find there's such inconsistency that we do need some type of blanket standard to say this is the minimal you shall do."

The teachers who were involved in a process which was only summative in nature, were faced with less consistent and clear guidelines for the implementation of the process. This created a feeling of distrust toward the administrator and an indifference with the process.

Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease (1983) specified as one of the four minimal conditions for successful evaluation systems that "all individuals in the system understand the criteria and processes for teacher evaluation" (as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 8). However, the principals in these summative models did not seem to feel it necessary to inform all the stakeholders of the plan or to have a plan that was developed by all of the stakeholders. As the plan was not shared, the teachers were allowed very little active participation in their evaluation process.

Table 4 Comparison of Process Components

Teacher	Category	Goal setting	Initial conference	Observation	Other data sources	Final conference	Final report	Teacher perception
Carla*	Summative	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	not useful
Vera*	Summative	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	not useful
Norm	Summative	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	not useful
Kelly	Summative	yes	no	no	no	no	unsure	not useful
Lillith	Summative	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	not useful
Diane	Summative	yes	no	no	no	no	unsure	not useful
Rebecca	Formative	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	useful
Sam	Formative	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	useful
Fraser	Formative	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	useful
Cliff	Formative	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	useful

*Pilot study participant

Natriello and Dornbusch (1980-81) conducted interviews with teachers in which they concluded: "Teachers in these studies indicated that evaluation criteria were seldom shared with teachers, that teachers were uninformed about the information collected to evaluate their performance, and that minimal time was taken to communicate evaluation results to them" (as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 6). This description of teacher evaluation mirrors those given by the respondents in this study. It appears that little has changed for some teachers in the past 15 years, as many are still not allowed to be active participants in their own evaluation.

Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy (1993) when examining this type of hierarchical relationship between supervisor and teacher suggested: "A lack of understanding of the process due to lack of information or to the deliberate manipulation of information suggests that one partner in the relationship seeks to retain power" (p. 296). Gordon (1992) believed that control in the evaluation process which is related to power and hierarchy, must be replaced by empowerment for teachers to be partners in the process as was the case in the formative models.

The positive attitude toward the process by the teachers involved in a formative model can be linked to their active participation. McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) saw this participation as being the initial building block to a successful process.

> Teacher participation in the development and implementation of an evaluation scheme is the most effective strategy for developing congruence between teachers' values and expectations, organizational goals, and evaluation activities. In addition participation of this nature also promotes the sense of ownership essential to effective implementation and the collegiality that increases general support within the organization. (p. 30)

Root and Overly (1990) echoed the need for teachers' active involvement in the process from its inception, "Ownership is an important factor in the successful operation of most enterprises. Therefore, to develop a strategy for teacher evaluation that will be effective and accepted, teachers must play a vital role in its development" (p. 35).

Goal Setting. One of the common characteristics in both the summative and formative processes was that of teacher selected goals as the initial step in the process. All teachers reported a goal setting component to the process. What arose as a difference between teachers in the formative and summative processes was that those in the formative process felt that the goals they chose were meant to assist in their own growth. The teachers were aware that these would be monitored through the supervision process. Cliff when describing the goal setting process stated:

> It's just another step that I just do and move because I've built it in already. Every two years we need to declare to the administration what are the goals and what areas need[ing] improvement or what kind of achievements we would like to undertake in the following year. And so that is submitted....At the end of the year we write our own achievement review. And I would say again, as I said before, that those things would be observed here, there and everywhere.

Fraser related a similar experience:

> At that time in your enhancement year you sit down and you submit to the administrator a couple of points that you'd like to work on for professional development individually that year. And then you monitor yourself...its virtually a mini research proposal that you do.

Fraser described how these goals were determined by linking them to both district and school goals. "So that those goals that you establish and discuss would enhance your individual classroom goals....You might want to work with just a couple of specific students. These things would be discussed." Rebecca elaborated further on the process of goal setting:

> From year-to-year you are expected to set priorities, each teacher sets priorities. And its done in writing. There's a form that you fill in, your priority. How you plan to approach it and indicators that you will have achieved it....then we're reminded of it about halfway through the year...by memo by the principal. And then later in the year we are expected to hand in a written response to it. And we meet with our supervisor and discuss what we've accomplished. And then we hand that in of course.

When questioned about the value of the goal setting component of the formative process, Rebecca stated, "I don't think I'd be quite that focused if I hadn't had the input into it. And I didn't know that there was going to be some accountability at the end."

Similarly, Sam indicated that he also set goals which were then discussed with the administrator.

> We set our goals and they must tie into the district and the school priorities. And the rest you meet and discuss it. And you either delete a few that you don't or the administrator may not feel is [sic] realistic for you at this time or you add to them.

The teachers in the formative category spoke very enthusiastically about setting goals and believed strongly that this process allowed for *their* input into *their* own professional growth.

Those respondents in the summative group did not have the same perception of goal setting. Kelly described the process contemptuously:

> The administration has given us a piece of paper in August or September when we started. And we filled it in...what is [sic] your goals. I never talked to him [principal] about it....And now I got that form back in my mailbox last week. Fill it out and hand it in. So there's no meeting to hand it in.

For Kelly, the process of setting a goal had little meaning and it appeared to be unrelated to other aspects of the evaluation process.

Norm described quite an in-depth process of setting and sharing goals with the administration. When asked if the attainment of the goals or professional development was monitored, Norm stated "No, there's no monitoring really." When Norm was questioned if it was possible to choose a goal that he had previously met and submit it, he replied "yes." For Norm the process of goal setting was unrelated to professional growth because the process did not check for accountability.

Diane described the process of goal setting at her school as follows:

> I think we had a sort of two-page questionnaire thing at the beginning of the year. And it started off with your personal goals, your professional goals and how you were going to achieve the....And then those two pieces of paper have not been referred to all year.

Goal setting was a reality for all of the teachers in the study. The usefulness of the goal setting process was perceived very differently by teachers involved in a summative process and those in the formative process. McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) described the importance of goal setting as follows. "The goal setting process that lies at the heart of each evaluation system, when approached seriously, enables teachers to

integrate their own professional growth with improved classroom practice" (p. 75). Perhaps the perception of the teachers in the summative process was that the goal setting component was not taken seriously by the administrators as there was little or no monitoring of their attainment.

For those teachers in the formative process, goal setting did enable the integration of professional growth and improved classroom performance (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988). These findings are comparable to those by Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy (1993). They concluded:

> Teachers in situations where they were recognized as competent and given responsibility for identifying their own professional goals, described the process as both positive and challenging. They enjoyed the support of the administrator and of their teaching colleagues in establishing goals which not only enhanced their teaching but which also often contributed to the achievement of school-wide goals. (p. 297)

In summary, setting a priority or personal /professional goal for the school year was seen to be a valuable and useful process for the teachers participating in a formative model of supervision. It was seen as a focus for growth and the teachers were prepared to share how that goal was met with the administrator in an end of year meeting.

Teachers involved in the summative process appeared to perceive the goal setting component as having little or no link to the evaluation process. Many knew that there would be no monitoring of their goals by the administrators and they would be solely responsible for determining success. For the teachers involved in the summative process, lack of monitoring of the goals combined with little or no data collection on the part of the administrators, isolated the goal setting process as simply another "administrivial" duty.

Trust and The Role of the Evaluator. All respondents spoke of trust, integrity and the need to respect the evaluator in the process. Many spoke of the stress involved with the formal observations involved in their process, but felt that this was not overwhelming as they all perceived themselves to be competent teachers. Fraser described the process as:

> It was for me, a very relaxed, amicable growing experience. Now I'm talking as a teacher who feels very comfortable with the classroom and [is] confident....That had to do to a certain extent with the working relationship within the school, it's a very cooperative one....With my specific appraiser he's a very positive person, he's a very empathetic person which meant that he was always able to put these in a positive light. Which I think again is of course, very much less threatening.

Sam also spoke of competence of the teacher and the need to respect and trust the evaluators as being key to the evaluation process.

> You're good or you shouldn't be there. But how can you be better? And it can only be somebody observing you, and somebody that you respect and that you would listen to or else it means nothing. If the individual hasn't somehow demonstrated that they have the skills in place, how in the heck are they going to respond to you.

Cliff spoke of a "professional relationship" between the evaluator and teacher with regard to formal evaluations. "I think that requires really professional commitment on both sides and integrity and honesty and trust."

Teachers involved in the summative process also perceived themselves as competent and respected by the evaluator, but due to the lack of a clear description of

the process, were unsure of how the data gathered were going to be used and what was the purpose of the observations. This left many with an uneasy feeling regarding the process. Although Norm was never observed in the classroom by his administrator he felt that these were unnecessary:

> I've been in situations where I had a lot of classroom visitations. And also situations where there's no classroom visitations and I tell you the honest truth I'm a bit ambivalent about it. It doesn't matter to me. I feel I do my job and so if people want to come in and watch me that's fine.

When probed whether observations could allow for changes in his teaching, Norm responded:

> I think it might be of an assistance but in order for that to happen the individual who is coming in would have to be someone whom I felt were in my view I could trust to give me useful criticism.

Kelly spoke of the need to have respect for the evaluator's knowledge and skills:

> It sounds awful, but if I don't really respect the person that I'm going to be evaluated by, I give no credence to what they tell me. And I don't really feel this man knows really good teaching strategies. I don't feel that he uses those types of strategies in how he deals with staff. So I don't think he would use them with children.

Kelly also spoke about the use of data collected. "What are you going to do with that information and where's it going to go. And if its going to be used to the benefit of both of us."

Lillith related her concern regarding the lack of knowledge that her administrator had in her specific area. "I know my principal trusts what I'm doing is competent but he really can't assist me much more."

Trust and respect for the evaluator was mentioned by most of the respondents as an important factor in the evaluation process. It appeared that there was a great deal more trust between the teachers and supervisors in the formative process. McBride and Skau (1995) describe the relationship between trust and supervision as follows:

> A belief in trust as central to supervision suggests that, in Gilligan's words, "one is able to have an effect on others, as well as the recognition that interdependence of attachment empowers both the self and the other, not at the other's expense." (p.264)

The empowerment and interdependence described above relates to the relationship between the teachers and supervisors in the formative models.

Contrast this with the apparent lack of trust described by the teachers involved in the summative processes. In these situations, there was little communication between administrator and teacher regarding the process and how the data would be used. This mistrust could be symptomatic of a possible lack of commitment on the part of the administrator toward the evaluation process or the need to retain power and control of the evaluation process as described by Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy, 1993. The authors linked the lack of trust to the "control of both the process and the report...in the hands of the evaluator" and how this created in teachers, "high levels of concern about the fairness issues and about the qualifications of the evaluator for the task" (p. 5). These feelings were apparent from the respondents in this research. McBride and Skau (1995) attempt to explain the relationship between trust and commitment. "Supervisors who appear rushed or distracted or to be simply going through the motions likely will not be trusted by those with whom they work" (p. 266).

Teachers engaged in the summative process felt competent but did not appear to have the same level of trust in the competency of the evaluators to understand their individual contexts. There was also an uneasiness regarding the manner in which data collected were to be used.

Those teachers in the formative model spoke of a professionalism and trust between administrator and teacher. They echoed the need to respect the competency of the evaluator, but unlike those in the summative process, appeared to have that trust and respect.

Data Gathering Techniques. For the teachers involved in the formative supervision model, data were gathered from a variety of sources including informal and formal observations by the administrator, use of video tapes and in one situation through the use of a teaching laboratory. Teachers also related that administrators included feedback regarding their relationships with parents and students, contributions to the school community, reports and other documents as data.

Fraser described the process of data collection for his formal observation. "It was essentially an observation tool where he would mark down, for example, what was happening every three minutes...essentially a thirty minute analysis on-going analysis of the dynamics of the class." Fraser continues with a description of informal data collection:

> I would suggest that perhaps most of the evaluation is done almost intuitively. As an administrator you can tell from, for example, the condition of the classroom when the students leave about how well in control it is. You can tell from the type of grades the teacher is giving....You can also tell from parental concerns that come through the office.

Rebecca felt that there had been a change in the focus of the teacher role from the classroom, to a more whole school focus. "I think there's more of an emphasis on the teacher's involvement in the whole school, the contributions to the school and extracurricular contributions...and therefore contributions to the community."

Sam also spoke of the greater contribution of the teacher as being important in the evaluation process. "You get a little bigger picture of what you've done. So its performance as a teacher, but performance in the building as well." Cliff spoke again about the big picture in relation to evaluating teacher performance.

> Every day is an evaluation. Every time I bring a student into the office. Every time I sit on a committee and when I talk to parents. When parents talk to the administrator. When they talk to me. When I'm dealing with children. In fact when the teachers see me in the hall. When other teachers or kids see me in the hallway and an administrator sees me talking to a kid. An administrator sees me on supervision. When he sees or she sees me in the roles, these other roles I've taken on.

Cliff also discussed the use of student report cards as a source of evaluation data. He stated: "I know that documentation was taken from my report card marks and comments."

For all respondents in the formative group, the data collected were more than a cursory classroom visit. Stiggins and Duke (1988) supported the gathering of data from a variety of sources including classroom observations. They suggest that "not all meaningful phenomena can be easily observed" (p.138). To this end they suggested, as was demonstrated in the experiences of the formative group, that data to encourage professional growth be derived from test results, discussions with students, artifacts

such as lesson plans, grade books, and the encouragement of systematic reflection by the teacher (Stiggins and Duke, 1988).

Those teachers in the summative models did not perceive evaluation to be any more than a formal classroom observation, or a result statement from their goals. Lillith spoke of the evaluator not looking at specific criteria during the classroom observation.

> What's interesting is he came in not initially looking on [sic] a specific criteria which I would have preferred. I think he did a good job. But you know the process, I think, would be better if he knew some specific goals to look at.

Norm, Kelly and Diane were totally responsible for the data used in their evaluations. Norm stated that there was no monitoring of goals and there was no classroom observations. Kelly described a process of choosing goals at the start of the school year and then revisiting this at the end of the year.

There was no evidence that data in the summative model was derived from any other source than formal classroom visits. Lillith was the only teacher in this category who reported any data gathering by her supervisor. Considering these teachers knew a formal report would be written on their performance with little of no data to substantiate the conclusions, it is easy to understand their nonchalant attitude toward the process.

For those in the summative group *if and when* data were collected regarding classroom performance, it was through the traditional formal observations. This type of data gathering is typical of the traditional process as outlined by Wise, Darling-Hammond and Bernstein (1984) and Stiggins and Bridgeford, (1985).

Sharing Feedback. Those teachers who were involved in a formative system reported that the feedback they received as a result of observations and other data gathering techniques was timely and useful. Many used the feedback to reflect on their teaching. These teachers also reported that the least useful part of the feedback was the final report which they felt was more for personnel decisions. All the respondents in this category reported to have the opportunity to share the feedback with their supervisor in a conference.

Sam reported that the timeliness of the feedback was an important aspect to the success of the evaluation process. "After the last couple of years we've tried to do it, post observation conference, immediately so that it's very fresh in, not only the evaluator's mind, but the teacher's mind." When Sam was questioned in regards to how the sharing of data made him feel he replied: "Honestly it made me feel great....If the feedback is positive. Positive reinforcement, you really can't get enough of it." Sam then discussed the importance of the feedback for his own personal and professional growth.

> I mean I'm always there to learn. How can I teach better? More so now than ever before because I think the first three or four years that you're in the classroom, if anybody's watching you, you just give yourself feedback. Am I doing this right?...But once you move beyond that you can actually start putting some suggestions to use.

Rebecca also had the opportunity to discuss goals and data gathered from observations with the supervisor.

> And then usually it, classroom observation, is followed up in the interview that we have at the end, close to the end of the year where we sit down and look at the formal evaluation together....and at that time you would talk about, if he, the evaluator, had been in for a formal evaluation you

would talk about perhaps the notes he did there. Otherwise it's a sharing of the priorities that you set and your perceptions of whether you met them or not. Why perhaps you did or didn't, that type of thing.

Rebecca then discussed the compilation of the final evaluation report which she stated occurred every year.

I sign two copies. One he, [the supervisor], keeps and one I keep. And then we're always told if we wish a copy be placed in our file that we should request that. One other thing, on this form that we fill in at the end of the year, there's always a chance for teacher response at the bottom.

Cliff felt that the feedback received from the evaluator was very useful for his own professional growth and as a check on his own perceptions of classroom interactions:

And the very interesting thing about that is the feedback, the written feedback was what I wanted. You know the review and evaluation, the on-task, the student impact, the contributions, the interaction, the conversation, the conversation interaction. That was one of the dynamics that was looked for. I was very aware. There was no surprise in any of that information. And so I'm really happy with what I've done in terms of my own feedback for myself as a professional....When I look at the data I look at it neutrally, quite neutrally. And I look at frequency...Am I aware of this? Because to me what data does [sic] is to double check my level of awareness if in fact I'm choosing to work here, here, and here. I'm certainly hoping that there's a standard of excellence there in all of those areas. But what I think my choice is, do I want to use that tool at that time for that result?

Cliff continues with the idea of feedback as just another method to check his own perceptions.

> I think that's what this evaluation policy does. It builds in feedback because there are not a lot of other feedback loops in teaching besides yourself and besides your kids and the parents who are second hand. There's a lot of data [sic] going out but not a lot of data, objective or quantified data coming back so that he can work with it to have a choice. And I think that's what this provides.

As with Sam, Cliff found that the feedback was in fact a boost or a form of positive reinforcement.

> I like to hear what they see me doing well at. I don't want the platitude. I'd like to know specific information, what did you see here and what did you like....I want more specific refined information at this point. Feedback is always great. Feedback, you know with teachers, what is this saying, compliment a teacher once and they'll [sic] be good for six months.

The teachers involved in the summative process were less positive regarding feedback. For some of the teachers there was no monitoring of their goals, and therefore no feedback from the administration. Most did not have the option of a conference with the administrator and if it did occur, the administrator had collected no data to provide feedback.

Lillith felt that due to her specialization, the administrator at the school would be unable to provide appropriate feedback, and so looked outside of her school for meaningful feedback.

> I was joking with my assistant and I said, you know, we could teach basket weaving probably next year and nobody would be coming and

> evaluating me. And I actually like to have the evaluation. And I like someone to know my specific area and be able to give me meaningful feedback. So like I say, I've had a lot of consultants and then it's done.

The final aspect of any evaluation or supervision model deals with the supplying of feedback to the teachers.

> Teacher evaluation potentially is such a powerful feedback mechanism because evaluation is a way of *giving* meaning to activity. But it can play this important role only if it is received, if it is heard, and it is acted upon. (McLaughlin and Pfeifer, 1988, p. 46)

The respondents from the summative process reported dissatisfaction with the information they received regarding their performance for the year. For some, they did not even receive feedback before the end of the school year. McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) state: "...to be effective, feedback must be geared to the rhythms of the classroom" (p. 47).

Johnson (1990), described the problem as it existed for teachers in this study and in many other schools:

> Despite the general consensus that administrative feedback is of little use, teachers in numerous studies report that they would like more feedback on their performance from administrators and colleagues. The problem is not that teachers resist feedback but that what they get they consider useless. Teachers report that the problems with the feedback that they receive include infrequent and/or superficial observations, evaluators who lack subject matter/pedagogical knowledge and observation skills...and potentially negative consequences that create a threatening environment. (as cited in Firestone and Pennell, 1993, p. 504)

Those teachers involved in the formative model had a very different view of feedback. They felt the feedback was effective in assisting with their professional growth. The feedback received by these teachers met the four criteria of effective feedback outlined by McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988); timeliness, specificity, credibility and intent.

Use of Incentive Programs. Teachers from both the formative and summative categories had similar feelings about the use of incentive programs. All of the respondents believed that excellence needed to be recognized, but many were unsure of the criteria that would be used to determine excellence. Norm stated:

> I think one of the difficulties with merit pay is that you have to look at what it is based on. Anytime you have individuals making decisions about other individuals that are going to require or have to do with money, you run into a large conflict of interest. A big problem with trying to maintain objectivity.

Rebecca stated the problem as follows:

> I'm torn on this and I admit it. It's nice for teachers who have made the extra effort to be recognized....But on the other hand, I think that a lot of teachers do a superb job....And I'm not sure that singling out one or two per staff would do anything for staff morale and the rapport that 's been built upon a staff. For example, on our staff we have not nominated anyone and it's been a choice not to. Because we feel that it might be slightly divisive.

Sam also reflected similar sentiments.

> First part first, should teachers be rated and given incentives? Certainly. There are a lot of better teachers than others out there. And it would be nice to earn more based on your abilities. But until a super computer, that can view from above and get inside a mind and follow the students you taught for their lifetime to see your effect, how would it be possible?

Sam also felt that the only benefit to rewarding excellence would be for public relations, (PR) purposes.

> This is once again PR. And the public is notified that these are the individuals who have been rated as excellent. They're not aware of the procedure. They just think somehow the world has looked down on these teachers and go wow! And so when they're published, people here...can go, look at this, we have all of these excellent teachers.

Fraser believed that the best rewards of teaching are intrinsic. "To my way of thinking the best merit pay a competent teacher can get is the results that she [sic] sees developing in her [sic] students and the feedback for parents." Fraser continued to present what he felt were the problems with a formalized system. When asked about identifying excellent teachers Fraser responded. "Again that can be done very political. It can be that the teacher is particularly charismatic."

> This was the similar to Kelly's view, she indicated that:
>
> I have a problem with it. I have a problem in the fact that I know some absolutely superb teachers that feel that those types of awards are very political. And I believe they are. And, you know, to me somebody can be nominated for that type of thing and yes they're very good in the confines in which they're in ....If you have a principal that really wants to push you forward you will look great.

Kelly then shared her views regarding rating teachers in the evaluation process.

> And again with ratings, its like who is going to rate, how are they going to rate you? And do I have to be good friends with them to get a good rating. And then how do I feel teaching beside someone when I know I'm the worse [sic] on staff. I don't want to work on a staff if I know that I'm number three and everyone else is five. So I think it creates a lot of tension.

Cliff echoed the sentiments of the other respondents.

> Well I think excellence should be acknowledged. When you're dealing with people and when you're dealing with a qualitative commodity, I'll try to take it to that realm, there are not clear delineations. It'll always be a lot of conversation without results. It's nice to highlight excellence in teaching. It's nice to have those awards. But don't let me think those are the only excellent teachers. Okay. The same with career ladders. Who decides?

Cliff continues and questions both the process and the reward systems currently in use. "So I think, yes, reward and acknowledge quality but where and when and how and who? Can there be applications? Can there be scholarships? Can there be contests? Sure. Is that all? No."

It appeared that only one teacher in the study supported incentive programs. The respondents agreed that there were some teachers whose performance was exemplary, but they questioned criteria used, the destruction of cooperation and the creation of competition between teachers and the obvious political aspect of the selection process. "Advocates for differential incentive programs make a variety of arguments for them, but most center on the value of competition...they are seen as fairer because pay

follows performance" (Firestone and Pennell, 1993, p. 510). Stiggins and Duke (1988) claimed that the use of incentive programs, "rest[s] on the assumption that sound, effective evaluation procedures can be devised" (p. 1). Stiggins and Duke (1988) described the same shortcomings of evaluation systems as noted earlier. "Such cursory assignments are incapable of serving the evaluation needs of schools interested in rewarding outstanding performance (Popham, 1986) and do little to promote the professional development of teachers" (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985 as cited in Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 1). It would be difficult if not impossible to have a open sharing of professional ideas when teachers could be placed in direct competition with each other for monetary or other incentives.

In summary, regardless of the type of evaluation system the teachers were involved in, all believed that the acknowledgment of excellence in teaching was meritorious, but questioned the process and the criteria. Many felt it would create a climate of competition and destroy opportunities for the creation of a collaborative environment.

Proposed Changes to Teacher Evaluation Practices. Teachers involved in the formative model of teacher supervision felt the process could continue to move toward the encouragement of growth and improvement of instruction . Many felt, however, changes regarding the importance of the process had to be made first.

Cliff believed that as teachers were allowed more ownership and participation in the process, how it was viewed changed. "It comes in as a tool. It starts as a tool but as you work with it, if you take that tool, then it becomes a real process and everyone is changed by it." When asked how to improve the process, Cliff responded:

> So if truly this is that significant in teaching, dedicate some time to the process. Not on top of teaching, structured into part of what teaching is....But is this truly essential for the teachers for the years they are being

> evaluated, give then a half an hour once a week and call that their evaluation investment class....I don't think that's a lot to ask....An then I think you'll see significant results that year and for the next five because I think you're showing them and you're letting them experience the value of investing in themselves.

The above statement by Cliff stating the need for increased resources in the area of teacher supervision echoed that of Wise et. al, (1984): "The failure to concentrate resources will result in unfocused evaluation that consumes resources but produces information that serves neither teacher nor administrator" (cited in Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy, 1993, p. 15).

Rebecca felt the system she was involved in was satisfactory. "I'm really quite happy with the system that I'm experiencing right now...I think I have enough input into it."

Fraser believed the evaluation process should become more responsive to the professional growth of teachers.

> I would like to see where instead of increasing the student or teacher evaluation that that time and energy be put into more inservicing of the contemporary innovations... and the monies and the time, prep time as well as study time....And that's where I would like to see more emphasis placed on improving teacher competency...through professional growth. Through a support system, through the encouragement. Not in evaluating what you are doing now....And any extra time, effort, and money should be put into making us as able to capitalize on development and contemporary change.

Sam saw the importance of the evaluation process to be for more than just for the school. And that the use of video would be beneficial part of the system.

> I see it two-fold. I don't see it just for us, I see it heavily for PR purposes as well. Each school must be seen as evaluating its teachers...How to make it better, well you can bring in all forms of high-tech equipment...I think we could all benefit from seeing ourselves teach.

Teachers involved in the summative approach wanted a more responsive, participatory model; a formative model. Characteristics of these models included teacher collaboration, an environment which allowed risk taking, and direct and timely feedback related to specific goals and criteria. Many talked about a system that they had participated in previously which allowed for professional growth.

Kelly related an experience with the teacher effectiveness program.

> The only other time I've had someone that came in and said, okay what do you want me to watch for and watch, is when I went through the teacher effectiveness process....And I thought that was brilliant....It was useful because there was no risk. And it was useful because it was set up as a very trusting situation where somebody was going to come in and give suggestions not judgments....And I feel other evaluations are very judgmental.

Lillith described what she felt was important in regards to teacher evaluation.

> What I liked and what I've seen is where it is a very meaningful process. It's just to provide valuable feedback to the teacher....I like the team approach where colleagues, that's including the principal...but other teachers are the best to work with.

When Lillith was asked if she had experience with such a process, she related an experience from a former location.

A new curriculum coordinator came in....And she had a team of three. And what they would do is they would arrange times on their preps, and this is unfortunate it was on their preps, but they did go around and view each other. What is nice is the teacher, because competency wasn't an issue, the teacher[s] would sort of set goals for themselves. And they would say maybe I want to work on this area, so that way when people came in to observe, they could provide direct feedback on the area that they wanted to improve on. For example, if they wanted to ask kids more questions and move around the room more and be more visible in the class, then that's what the people would be specifically looking at. And that way I think you're really improving.

Norm talked briefly about the collegial model of supervision.

I was in one elementary school and we did peer coaching. And I found it quite useful. Because there's always things that you do that you don't realize you're doing....And what made it really useful was that it was generally someone who is teaching the same grade level that you were; and therefore, had similar concerns and it was more of a working together so that both could be better....And often times in teaching you tend to be pretty isolationist. We don't want to let anybody know that we're not, that we're having trouble or we're concerned about something. Because then we have this feeling that we're not doing it. But the reality is that we're all concerned all the time about the kids, about the curriculum, how we're going to get through it, what we're doing. And I think more of the collegial aspect would be beneficial.

Although teachers who had experienced a formative model appeared to be satisfied with the process, many believed the process could continue to be improved. Many of these teachers believed that commitment to the process by administration would be demonstrated through the allotment of time and resources as described by Wise et. al., cited in Haughey, Townsend, O'Reilly and Ratsoy, 1993.

The positive experiences of these teachers may be the first step in a change to the "new supervision" (Gordon, 1992). Gordon (1992) believed that any change that is long lasting must occur from within the teaching process in a grass roots manner. If it is accepted that change must occur from within, then the key to change in the evaluation system rests on the positive experiences of these teachers, and their ability to share these experiences with colleagues. Teachers who had been involved in the summative model desired a more formative model. Yet for these teachers a larger paradigm shift must occur. McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988) outline the change that must occur:

> Moving from defensiveness to trust, from a self-serving system to an open system of communication, from norms of hiding mistakes to norms of inquiry and risk taking, from viewing evaluation as a pro forma necessity to seeing evaluation as a central feature of a school system's organization, poses an organizational change problem of the highest order. (p. 5)

In summary, teachers involved in a formative system of supervision perceived the process to be an integral part of their own professional growth. However, those involved in a summative system, expressed frustration, mistrust, and perceived the process to be of little or no use. Tenured teachers, for the most part do not need to be told they are competent; they know that. What must to implemented is a process which recognizes the needs of these teachers, and demonstrates trust in their competency to control and guide their own continued development as professionals.

Responses to the Research Questions

This research was guided by two main research questions and two related sub-questions. The discussion will address the sub-problems first and then offer tentative responses to the main research question.

Research sub-problem #1: What effects do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had on their own professional growth? Teachers who were involved in a formative model of teacher supervision felt the process did have a positive impact on their own professional growth. These models were characterized by: (a) teacher knowledge and input into the process, (b) trust and respect of their supervisor, (c) feedback that was useful, and (d) an attitude that growth would occur.

Those teachers involved in the summative or traditional model felt the process did not have an effect on their own professional growth. Many treated the process with indifference and invested a minimal effort.

Research sub-problem #2: What impact do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had in terms of their classroom instruction? It appears that teachers involved in a formative process, found the feedback and observations to have a positive impact on their instructional strategies. These teachers spoke of the importance of learning from a respected colleague and using the feedback received in self reflection.

For those teachers involved in the summative process no impact, positive or negative was reported on their instructional skills. For those who did not have any formal or informal observation in the process, assistance by the administrator was non-

existent. Teachers in this category also spoke of not respecting the evaluator and of questioning the evaluators' experience in their specialty area to provide assistance.

Main Research Question #1: How do tenured teachers perceive evaluation practices? Teachers' perceptions of evaluation practices appears to be dependent on the type of evaluation process in which they are involved. All of the tenured teachers interviewed saw value in an evaluation system which allowed active participation on their part and assisted in professional growth. The teachers currently involved in the summative models however, perceived it to have little or no impact on their personal or professional growth. The teachers involved in summative models did not voice strong opposition to these models as the researcher believed would have occurred. What was noticed was a feeling of indifference and nonchalance by these respondent toward the entire evaluation process.

Main Research Question #2: Does a difference in perception exist between tenured teachers who are involved in a formative evaluation model and those involved in a traditional, summative model? It appears that a difference in perception does exist between teachers involved in a formative model and those involved in a summative model. Teachers involved in a formative model had a more positive perception of the teacher evaluation process. In fact, these teachers do not see the process as judgmental or evaluative in nature, but instead as a learning and growing process. They also appeared to trust and respect their administrators or supervisors to a greater degree than the teachers involved in a summative process. Although both groups of teachers interviewed saw themselves as competent teachers; those involved in the formative system looked forward to the opportunity to discuss and reflect on supervisory suggestions and input. Those involved in the summative evaluation model, only often did not feel that the evaluator had the knowledge or specialization

that would allow an appropriate understanding of their situations. Some of these respondents also did not appear to have faith that their supervisors understood what good teaching and learning entailed. Teachers in the summative model appeared to mirror the minimal time and effort that they felt was being spent on the process by their supervisors.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section includes an overview of the study. The second section addresses conclusions reached through the analysis of the data. The final section addresses recommendations emerging from the conclusions. These recommendations fall into two categories, those for practice and those for theory.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of tenured teachers toward evaluation practices. It was important to examine teachers' perceptions as these attitudes and perceptions often determine the success or failure of these systems.

It was the intent of the study to address the following questions:

1. How do tenured teachers perceive evaluation practices?
2. Does a difference in perception exist between teachers who are involved in a formative supervision model and those involved in a traditional, summative model?

The related sub-problems were:

1. What effects do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had on their own professional growth?
2. What impact do teachers feel that the evaluation practices have had in terms of improvement of instruction?

The literature reviewed supported the need for a more responsive, growth oriented system of supervision for the competent tenured teacher. A great deal of research in the area of teacher evaluation and supervision which continually supported this

premise was evident, yet change in practice has not occurred. Teachers involved in the traditional summative model voiced the same frustration and demonstrated the same lack of commitment to these evaluation processes as has occurred for decades.

The Alberta government recognized this discontentment and has proposed the development of a two-pronged formative and summative policy. For this new policy to be successful, teachers in Alberta need to have the opportunity to voice both their concerns and successes regarding their experiences with evaluation. In this way, a more grass-roots, participatory policy can be developed and teachers will have the opportunity to be involved in an evaluation process which encourages and fosters professional growth.

The data were gathered through the use of semi-structured interviews. The respondents were chosen from set criteria and fell into two categories; those involved in a summative process and those in a formative process. In this way, a comparison between the two categories could be made and areas for improvement could be identified. Interviews were audio-taped, transcribed and analyzed to determine common themes.

As the interviews were semi-structured, many of the themes were predetermined. There were surprising similarities within the two categories of teachers as well as large differences between them. These themes were consistent with previous research findings that had been reported in the literature. All of the teachers who were interviewed saw potential in teacher supervision processes for fostering professional growth. For some it was a reality, for others, a memory and a hope for the future.

Conclusions

McLaughlin and Pfeifer's (1988) assertion that "the effectiveness of any teacher evaluation system--its ability to promote genuine accountability, its ability to

contribute valid, reliable information to teachers' improvement--depends finally on the responses of those being evaluated" (p. 4) applied to the respondents in this study.

Subsequent to careful consideration of the findings, the following conclusions presented themselves.

1. Teachers need to be actively involved in the teacher supervision process for it to be successful. This participation includes understanding and input into the process and its purpose. This participation gives teachers a voice and assists in the creation of an openness and trust between teacher and supervisor.

2. The goal setting element of the supervision process plays an integral role in focusing teachers' direction and becoming a framework for professional growth. To be effective however, these goals must be discussed and monitored by both the teacher and the supervisor.

3. The data collection element of the process needs to be from a variety of sources and then shared with the teacher in a manner that is timely, specific, credible and with the intent of improvement.

4. The implementation of incentive programs is surrounded with difficulties such as criteria, the creation of a competitive work environment and its inherent political nature. Respondents in this study felt these difficulties outweighed the perceived benefits of the programs.

5. Teachers involved in a summative process only perceived the process to have little or no impact on their professional growth or improvement of instruction. They did

voice the desire to be involved in a more responsive participatory supervision process.

6. Teachers wish to be given the opportunity to work in a collaborative manner with peers and/or administration in the evaluation process.

Recommendations

Five recommendations for individuals interested in applying the present findings to practice and research emerge from the above conclusions. The first three recommendations address practical issues of implementing a teacher supervision process that is responsive to the needs of the tenured teacher.

1. All teachers must be informed of the supervision process and have an opportunity to input the process. Clear description of the process and its purpose is an important element in the development of trust between supervisor and teacher or between teacher collaborators.

2. Teachers must be given the support of their administrators throughout the supervision process. This includes monitoring of goals, and the collection of data upon which reflections and goal attainment can be based. In the case of teacher collaborative models, administration should assist with resources and scheduling to facilitate the process.

3. Incentive programs such as merit pay, career ladders should not be implemented for teachers because of the inadequacies of the methods currently available for measuring meritorious performance.

The final two recommendations are directed toward continued research in the area of teacher supervision.

1. Interviews with administrators to determine their understanding, knowledge and perceptions of teacher supervision be undertaken. It appeared that the tone toward the supervision process set by the administrator was reflected by the teachers.

2. An examination of inservice programs for administrators and teachers in the area of supervision should be undertaken. From this, similar programs can be established.

Personal Reflection: A Final Word

Most teachers are dedicated professionals. They are life long learners who seek opportunities to grow and improve their instructional skills. The time constraints placed on teachers, due to the very nature of their work day, often make this difficult. Yet the one opportunity for learning to occur within the current framework, teacher supervision, is often overlooked.

Respondents in this study who had been involved in a formative process were brimming with enthusiasm and optimism regarding the process and its role in their own growth. This enthusiasm was both unexpected and surprising. But it was a "kernel of hope."

It is hope for those teachers who are in situations where the supervision process is perceived as simply another piece of "administrivia".

Will change occur? Will all teachers have the opportunity to participate in a supervision process which demonstrates respect for them as professionals, allows them to determine the direction of future growth and provides them support and feedback

required to attain their goals? Perhaps where the solution will come from is best summed up by Gordon (1992):

> The paradigm shift from the old to the new supervision, if it takes place, will be gradual in the sense that over time, increasing numbers of individuals will experience such conversions, and those committed to the new supervision will gradually become the majority....While new paradigms within communities of university scholars or within state agencies will certainly influence school practitioners, it is within the community of practitioners that the new paradigm must prevail if real changes in curriculum and instructional leadership are to take place. Moreover, significant numbers of *teachers* must become aware of and part of the new supervision if it is to succeed. (p. 76)

Teachers must have the voice to share their needs regarding supervision, but even more important than the voice, is an ear to listen and the opportunity to collaborate and make the necessary changes. Teachers are too important not to be heard.

References

Alberta Education. (1993). Toward teacher growth: A study of the impact of Alberta's teacher evaluation policy. Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Barber, L. (1984). Teacher evaluation and merit pay. Evaluation of Teaching: The formative process. Phi Delta Kappan Center on Evaluation, Development and Research. 75-84.

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. (Fifth Ed.). New York: Longman.

Bryant, M. & Currin, D.(1995). Views of teacher evaluation from novice and expert evaluators. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 10 (3), 262-277.

Dagley, D.L. & Orso, K.J. (1991, September) Integrating summative, formative modes of evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. 75 (536), 72-82.

DePasquale, D. Jr. (1990). Evaluating tenured teachers: A practical approach. NASSP Bulletin. 74(527), 19-23.

Firestone, W. A. & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. Review of Educational Research. 63 (4), 489-519.

Garvie, N.(1990). Position, power and formative supervision. The Canadian School Executive. 10(5), 23-24.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. (1990) Educative possibilities in teacher evaluation: Two approaches. NASSP Bulletin. 74 (527), 25-31.

Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J.(1989). Teacher evaluation: Educative Alternatives. New York: The Falmer Press.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexander VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (Second ed.). Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Gordon, S. P.(1992) Perspectives and imperatives: Paradigms, transitions, and the new supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 8 (1), 62-76.

Grimmett, P.P. (1987). The role of district supervisors in the implementation of peer coaching. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 3, 3-28.

Gray, L, Mclaughlin, T.F. and Bialozor, R.C. (1992). Collaborative teacher supervision. The Canadian School Executive 12(6), 17-21.

Guba, E. and Lincoln, Y. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park Ca.: Sage Publications.

Hatry, H., Greiner, J and Ashford, B. (1994). Issues and case studies in teacher incentive plans (Second Ed). Washington: The Urban Institute Press.

Hickcox, E.S. (1993). Teacher evaluation: A little scepticism is a good thing. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ONO6210)

Hickcox, E.S. (1993). The firing squad mentality: Reflections on the current state of performance review in schools. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No.ONO6211)

Hickcox, E. & Musella, D. (1989). Teacher performance and staff development. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ONO6198)

Manning, R. C. (1988). The teacher evaluation handbook. Englewood Cliffs NJ.: Prentice Hall.

McBride, M. & Skau, K.G. (1995). Trust empowerment, and reflection: Essentials of supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 10 (3), 262-277.

McLaughlin, M.W. & Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Neil, R. (1988). Toward the integration of teacher development with teacher evaluation aims. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 245)

Root, D. & Overly, D. (1990). Successful teacher evaluation--Key elements for success. NASSP Bulletin. 74(527), 34-38.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R.J. (1993). Supervision: A redefinition. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Smyth, J. (1991). Perspectives and imperatives: Instructional supervision and the redefinition of who does it in schools. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 7 (1), 90-99.

Stiggins, R.J. & Duke, D. (1988). The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation. New York: State University of New York Press.

Symonds, M.J. (1993). Attitudes of core French teachers in Newfoundland and Labrador to the teacher evaluation process: Implications for change. Unpublished Master's Thesis: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Valentine, J.W. (1992). Principles and practice for effective teacher evaluation. Needham Heights MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wiles, J.& Bondi, J. (1991). Supervision: A guide to practice. (Third Ed.). New York: Macmillian Publishing Co.

Zahorik, J. A. (1992). Perspective and Imperatives. Good teaching and supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 7 (4), 393-404.

Appendix A
Interview Questions

Tell me a bit about your history as a teacher.

How long have you had tenure with this school jurisdiction?

Which term (evaluation, teacher supervision, performance appraisals) do you use to describe the process you go through and why do you use that term?

Can you tell me about the process that you go through?

Do you have an opportunity to discuss classroom visits with the person who is coming in to see you?

How is the data collected shared with you?

How did you feel about the type of data that was collected and how it was shared with you?

In what ways do you feel that the data collected and shared with you through this process have affected your teaching in the classroom or your professional growth?

What do you think about the present process of teacher supervision/evaluation that is used in your school?

Have you found it valuable? If so how? If not, why not?

If it has been valuable, how could it be still made better?

If it has not been valuable, how could it be improved?

Have you noted a change in how evaluations are carried out during your teaching career? If so, in what ways? If not, why do you think there have been no changes?

Do you feel that teachers should be rated as to their level of performance in the classroom, and then rewarded through an incentive program? Can you explain why or why not?

Appendix B

Consent to Participate in Teacher Evaluation Study

Dear Colleague,

As a follow-up to the oral consent you provided to me to work with you in my study entitled "Perceptions of Teacher Evaluation, Formative vs. Summative", I am requesting you acknowledge your consent in written form. Please do so by signing the bottom of this letter. I have provided two copies so that you may keep one for your records.

As participants in this study you will be asked to partake in a semi-structured interview which consists of approximately 15 questions. The length of the interview will vary from 30 minutes to one hour.

You may at any time, withdraw your consent to participate in this study. I assure you that if you decide to opt out of this study you need not fear any form of retribution. Further more, all data collected will be treated as confidential--all names and places will be assigned pseudonyms in all documents which are used in my thesis. You will also be provided with transcripts of interviews so that you can identify any data which you do not wish me to use. Any data that you identify as sensitive will be deleted from the record before any analysis takes place.

Following the conclusions of this study, you will be provided with a summary of the results. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 922-6038 (home), At this time I would also wish to thank you for agreeing to work with me in this study. Your contribution is greatly valued.

Sincerely,

Tanni Parker

I, _____, acknowledge that I give permission to Tanni Parker of include me in the study as described above.

_____ _____

Signature Date